

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 85-~~685~~685

H. R. 13015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 13015.....	1
Digest of Public Law 85-685.....	2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 13015

- May 6, 1958 Senator Russell introduced S. 3756 which was referred to Senate Armed Services Committee. Print of bill.
- Rep. Vinson introduced H. R. 12360 which was referred to House Armed Services Committee. Print of bill.
- June 16, 1958 House Armed Services Committee agreed to report a clean bill in lieu of H. R. 12360.
- June 18, 1958 Rep. Vinson introduced H. R. 13015 which was referred to House Armed Services Committee. Print of bill.
- June 24, 1958 House Armed Services Committee reported H. R. 13015 with amendment. Print of bill and House Report No. 1957.
- July 1, 1958 House Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 13015. Print of H. Res. 617 and House Report No. 2104.
- July 9, 1958 House began debate on H. R. 13015.
- July 10, 1958 House passed H. R. 13015 with amendments.
- July 11, 1958 H. R. 13015 was referred to Senate Armed Services Committee.
- July 24, 1958 Senate committee ordered H. R. 13015 reported with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.
- July 28, 1958 Senate committee reported H. R. 13015 with amendment. Print of bill and Senate Report No. 1982.
- July 30, 1958 Senate passed H. R. 13015 with amendment and conferees were appointed.
- July 31, 1958 House conferees were appointed.
- Aug. 4, 1958 Conferees agreed to file report.
- Aug. 5, 1958 House received conference report. House Report No. 2429.
- Aug. 6, 1958 House agreed to conference report.
- Aug. 7, 1958 Senate agreed to conference report.
- Aug. 20, 1958 Approved: Public Law 85-685.

House hearings were held May 22, 23, 26, 27, 29, June 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18, and 24, 1958.

Senate hearings were held May 19 through July 10, 1958.

S. 3756

MAY 6, 1958

A BILL

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

1 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

2 TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

3 (Ordnance Corps)

4 Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing,
5 and utilities, \$2,697,000.

6 Detroit Arsenal, Michigan: Administrative facilities,
7 \$5,666,000.

8 Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Administrative facilities,
9 troop housing, and utilities, \$8,529,000.

10 Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois: Operational and training
11 facilities, \$570,000.

12 White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico: Operational
13 and training facilities, research, development and test facili-
14 ties, medical facilities, troop housing, and community facili-
15 ties, \$7,931,000.

16 (Quartermaster Corps)

17 Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational and training facilities,
18 and troop housing, \$4,630,000.

19 (Chemical Corps)

20 Army Chemical Center, Maryland: Troop housing, and
21 utilities, \$2,051,000.

22 Fort Detrick, Maryland: Research, development, and
23 test facilities, and troop housing, \$1,077,000.

24 Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Research, development,
25 and test facilities, \$250,000.

1 (Signal Corps)

2 Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, admin-
3 istrative facilities, troop housing, operational and training
4 facilities, and utilities, \$3,598,000.

5 (Corps of Engineers)

6 Army Map Service, Maryland: Operational and train-
7 ing facilities, \$1,913,000.

8 (Transportation Corps)

9 Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational and training facilities,
10 administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,-
11 634,000.

12 (Medical Corps)

13 Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Troop housing,
14 \$862,000.

15 FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

16 (First Army Area)

17 Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational and training
18 facilities, \$171,000.

19 Fort Dix, New Jersey: Troop housing, and utilities,
20 \$3,749,000.

21 (Second Army Area)

22 Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: Hospital facilities,
23 family housing, and real estate, \$2,274,000.

24 Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational and training facili-
25 ties, and utilities, \$516,000.

1 Fort Meade, Maryland: Operational and training facili-
2 ties, \$498,000.

3 Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Supply facilities, \$43,000.

4 (Third Army Area)

5 Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational and training facili-
6 ties, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop
7 housing, and family housing, \$4,189,000.

8 Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and training
9 facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,122,000.

10 Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational and training
11 facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and ad-
12 ministrative facilities, \$847,000.

13 Fort McClellan, Alabama: Operational and training
14 facilities, and hospital facilities, \$3,505,000.

15 Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facili-
16 ties, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop
17 housing, and utilities, \$2,826,000.

18 (Fourth Army Area)

19 Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities,
20 maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$13,-
21 734,000.

22 Fort Hood, Texas: Operational and training facilities,
23 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
24 ties, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,984,000.

25 Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities,

1 maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities,
2 \$3,227,000.

3 (Fifth Army Area)

4 Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Troop housing, and
5 family housing, \$783,000.

6 Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Operational and training
7 facilities, and troop housing, \$1,076,000.

8 Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational and training facilities,
9 and utilities, \$1,084,000.

10 (Sixth Army Area)

11 Baywood Park, California: Real estate, \$144,000.

12 Camp Desert Rock, Nevada: Maintenance facilities,
13 troop housing, and utilities, \$2,892,000.

14 Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational and training facil-
15 ities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,085,000.

16 Fort Ord, California: Operational and training facilities,
17 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-
18 munity facilities, and utilities, \$4,733,000.

19 Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Operational and training
20 facilities, \$173,000.

21 (Military Academy)

22 United States Military Academy, West Point, New
23 York: Troop housing, medical facilities, and community
24 facilities, \$5,844,000.

1 (Armed Forces Special Weapons)

2 Various locations: Maintenance facilities, community
3 facilities, and utilities, \$273,000.

4 (Tactical Installations Support Facilities)

5 Various locations: Maintenance facilities, \$6,311,000.

6 OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

7 (Alaskan Area)

8 Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training fa-
9 cilities, \$222,000.

10 Fairbanks Permafrost Research Area: Real estate,
11 \$7,000.

12 (Pacific Command Area)

13 Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: Operational and training
14 facilities, \$240,000.

15 Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Troop housing, \$593,000.

16 Fort Shafter, Hawaii: Supply facilities, maintenance
17 facilities, family housing, and community facilities, \$2,925,-
18 000.

19 Korea: Operational and training facilities, supply facili-
20 ties, and utilities, \$904,000.

21 (Caribbean Command Area)

22 Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: Maintenance facilities, \$462,-
23 000.

(United States Army, Europe)

France: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, and ground improvements, \$4,063,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$201,121,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$25,000,000: *Provided*, That

1 the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the
2 Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House
3 of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final deci-
4 sion to implement, of the cost of construction of any public
5 work undertaken under this section, including those real
6 estate actions pertaining thereto.

7 SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of
8 section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119,
9 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized
10 to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing
11 for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations
12 by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the pro-
13 visions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assist-
14 ance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other com-
15 modity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

16 Various locations, France, 298 units.

17 Vicenza, Italy, 371 units.

18 Army Security Agency, location 13, 91 units.

19 Gateway Communications Station, 174 units.

20 (b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the
21 Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended,
22 the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family
23 housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following
24 locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

- 1
- 2 Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, 316 units.
- 3 Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York, 120 units.
- 4 White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico, 275 units.
- 5 Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, 130 units.
- 6 Fort Lee, Virginia, 435 units.
- 7 Natick R&E, Massachusetts, 35 units.
- 8 Fort Belvoir, Virginia, 618 units.
- 9 Two Rock Ranch Station, California, 25 units.
- 10 Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 50 units.
- 11 Beaumont Army Hospital, Texas, 125 units.
- 12 Fort Dix, New Jersey, 702 units.
- 13 Fort Totten, New York, 130 units.
- 14 Fort Bragg, North Carolina, 367 units.
- 15 Fort Campbell, Kentucky, 837 units.
- 16 Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois, 65 units.
- 17 Fort Rucker, Alabama, 400 units.
- 18 Fort Carson, Colorado, 200 units.
- 19 Fort Stewart, Georgia, 73 units.
- 20 Fort Bliss, Texas, 410 units.
- 21 Fort Hood, Texas, 500 units.
- 22 Fort Sam Houston, Texas, 183 units.
- 23 Fort Sill, Oklahoma, 349 units.

- 1 Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 700 units.
- 2 Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, 200 units.
- 3 Fort Sheridan, Illinois, 50 units.
- 4 Forts Baker and Barry, California, 98 units.
- 5 Oakland Army Terminal, California, 88 units.
- 6 Fort Lewis, Washington, 1,231 units.
- 7 Branch United States Disciplinary Barracks, California,
- 8 160 units.
- 9 United States Military Academy, New York, 156 units.
- 10 Bossier Base, Louisiana, 200 units.
- 11 Fort Eustis, Virginia, 223 units.
- 12 Medina Base, Texas, 125 units.
- 13 Sandia Base, New Mexico, 213 units.
- 14 Army Air Defense Command Stations, 492 units.

15 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

- 16 Canal Zone, 330 units.
- 17 Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, 385 units.
- 18 Fort Shafter, Hawaii, 481 units.
- 19 SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress,
- 20 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
- 21 UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:
- 22 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICE FACILI-

1 TIES (Ordnance Corps)”, with respect to Pueblo Ordnance
2 Depot, Colorado, strike out “\$563,000” and insert in place
3 thereof “\$600,000”.

4 (b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as
5 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
6 tion 502 the amounts “\$44,407,000” and “\$134,075,000”
7 and inserting in place thereof “\$44,444,000” and “\$134,-
8 112,000”, respectively.

9 SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-
10 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading “CON-
11 TINENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

12 (1) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-
13 CILITIES (Ordnance Corps)”, with respect to Redstone
14 Arsenal, Alabama, strike out “\$2,865,000” and insert in
15 place thereof “\$4,180,000”.

16 (2) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
17 FACILITIES (Signal Corps)” with respect to Fort Mon-
18 mouth, New Jersey, strike out “\$615,000” and insert in
19 place thereof “\$731,000”; and with respect to Vint Hill
20 Farms Station, Virginia, strike out “\$695,000” and insert
21 in place thereof “\$1,022,000”.

22 (3) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES

1 FACILITIES (Corps of Engineers)”, with respect to Granite
2 City Engineer Depot, Illinois, strike out “\$1,822,000” and
3 insert in place thereof \$2,815,000”.

4 (4) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
5 FACILITIES (Medical Corps)”, with respect to Walter Reed
6 Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, strike out
7 “\$4,472,000” and insert in place thereof “\$6,714,000”.

8 (5) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
9 (Second Army Area)”, with respect to Fort George G.
10 Meade, Maryland, strike out “\$923,000” and insert in place
11 thereof “\$1,264,000”.

12 (6) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
13 (Fourth Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas,
14 strike out \$4,645,000” and insert in place thereof “\$4,-
15 965,000”; and with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike
16 out “\$3,053,000” and insert in place thereof “\$3,454,000”.

17 (7) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
18 (Sixth Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Ord, California,
19 strike out “\$1,407,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,-
20 742,000”.

21 (8) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
22 (Military Academy)”, with respect to the United States
23 Military Academy, New York, strike out “\$756,000” and
24 insert in place thereof “\$1,171,000”.

25 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as

1 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
2 502 the amounts “\$237,320,000” and “\$546,387,000” and
3 inserting in place thereof “\$244,125,000” and “\$553,192,-
4 000”, respectively.

5 SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Con-
6 gress, as amended is amended under the heading “INSIDE
7 THE UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

8 (1) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
9 FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)”, with respect to White
10 Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico, strike out “\$693,000”
11 and insert in place thereof “\$735,000”.

12 (2) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
13 FACILITIES (Chemical Corps)”, with respect to Camp
14 Detrick, Maryland, strike out “\$913,000” and insert in
15 place thereof “\$1,074,000”; and with respect to Dugway
16 Proving Ground, Utah, strike out “\$867,000” and insert
17 in place thereof “\$1,044,000”.

18 (3) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
19 FACILITIES (Signal Corps)”, with respect to Fort Huachuca,
20 Arizona, strike out “\$6,856,000” and insert in place thereof
21 “\$7,576,000”.

22 (4) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
23 FACILITIES (Corps of Engineers)”, with respect to Fort
24 Belvoir, Virginia, strike out “\$492,000” and insert in place
25 thereof “\$940,000”.

1 (5) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
2 FACILITIES (Transportation Corps)”, with respect to Fort
3 Eustis, Virginia, strike out “\$1,231,000” and insert in place
4 thereof “\$1,436,000”.

5 (6) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
6 (First Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Dix, New Jersey,
7 strike out “\$54,000” and insert in place thereof “\$68,000”.

8 (7) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
9 (Second Army Area)”, with respect to Fort George G.
10 Meade, Maryland, strike out “\$5,885,000” and insert in
11 place thereof “\$7,695,000”.

12 (8) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
13 (Third Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Benning, Geor-
14 gia, strike out “\$422,000” and insert in place thereof “\$616,-
15 000”; and with respect to Fort McClellan, Alabama, strike
16 out “\$397,000” and insert in place thereof “\$527,000”.

17 (9) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
18 (Fourth Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Hood, Texas,
19 strike out “\$2,457,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,846,-
20 000”.

21 (10) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
22 (Fifth Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Riley, Kansas,
23 strike out “\$1,519,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,892,-
24 000”.

25 (11) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

1 (Sixth Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Lewis, Wash-
 2 ington, strike out “\$3,022,000” and insert in place thereof
 3 “\$3,596,000”; and with respect to Fort Ord, California,
 4 strike out “\$223,000” and insert in place thereof “\$319,-
 5 000”.

6 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 7 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE THE
 8 UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

9 Under the subheading “(Alaskan Area)”, with respect
 10 to Wildwood Station (Kenai), strike out “\$352,000” and
 11 insert in place thereof “\$516,000”.

12 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 13 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
 14 402 the amounts “\$95,010,000”, “\$35,763,000”, and
 15 “\$334,104,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$100,343,-
 16 000”, “\$35,927,000”, and “\$339,601,000”, respectively.

17 SEC. 108. (a) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Con-
 18 gress, is amended under the heading “INSIDE THE UNITED
 19 STATES” in section 101 as follows:

20 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
 21 TIES (Corps of Engineers)” with respect to Cold Regions
 22 Laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire, strike out “\$2,-
 23 496,000” and insert in place thereof “\$3,787,000”.

24 (b) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth
 25 amended by striking out in clause

1 amounts “\$115,624,000” and “\$293,103,000” and insert-
2 ing in place thereof “\$116,915,000” and “\$294,394,000”.

3 TITLE II

4 SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or
5 develop military installations and facilities by acquiring,
6 constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing perma-
7 nent or temporary public works, including site preparation,
8 appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following
9 projects:

10 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

11 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

12 Naval Facility, Cape May, New Jersey: Operational
13 and training facilities, \$141,000.

14 Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Operational
15 and training facilities, \$500,000.

16 Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Op-
17 erational and training facilities, \$2,247,000.

18 Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California: Operational
19 and training facilities, \$766,000.

20 FLEET BASE FACILITIES

21 Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing,
22 and community facilities, \$1,709,000.

23 Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational and train-
24 ing facilities, \$2,546,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

(Naval Air Training Stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi:

Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, commodity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$14,940,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida:

Operational and training facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, and real estate, \$4,679,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational

and training facilities, \$114,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Maintenance

facilities, \$1,252,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Cali-

fornia: Operational and training facilities, \$47,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Opera-

tional and training facilities, \$80,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Fentress, Virginia:

Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina:

Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,

1 medical facilities, troop housing, administrative facilities,
2 and utilities and ground improvements, \$11,215,000.

3 Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational
4 and training facilities, \$74,000.

5 Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and
6 training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, admin-
7 istrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground
8 improvements, \$15,823,000.

9 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Opera-
10 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, community
11 facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$9,892,000.

12 Naval Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field, Florida: Oper-
13 ational and training facilities, \$142,000.

14 (Marine Corps Air Stations)

15 Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South
16 Carolina: Operational and training facilities and real estate,
17 \$4,352,000.

18 Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Caro-
19 lina: Operational and training facilities, and supply facili-
20 ties, \$1,067,000.

21 Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina:
22 Operational and training facilities, \$1,003,000.

23 Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Oper-
24 ational and training facilities, \$2,158,000.

(Special Purpose Air Stations)

Naval Air Facility, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, utilities, and operational and training facilities and real estate at the Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Webster Field, Maryland, \$18,521,000.

Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing (including operational and training facilities and troop housing on San Nicolas Island; and maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements at Camp Cooke) , \$13,841,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Depot, Newport, Rhode Island: Utilities, \$2,210,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Administrative facilities, \$128,000.

Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California: Administrative facilities, \$146,000.

1 MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

2 Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Op-
3 erational and training facilities, \$280,000.

4 Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South
5 Carolina: Utilities, \$462,000.

6 Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Op-
7 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop
8 housing, and utilities, \$5,138,000.

9 Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Operational
10 and training facilities, \$168,000.

11 Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California:
12 Utilities, \$206,000.

13 Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California:
14 Maintenance facilities, \$241,000.

15 ORDNANCE FACILITIES

16 Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Main-
17 tenance facilities, \$86,000.

18 Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California:
19 Supply facilities, \$129,000.

20 Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord, California: Main-
21 tenance facilities, \$2,517,000.

22 Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, California: Re-
23 search, development, and test facilities, \$510,000.

1 Naval Proving Grounds, Dahlgren, Virginia: Research,
2 development, and test facilities, \$44,000.

3 Naval Ammunition Depot, Hingham, Massachusetts:
4 Maintenance facilities, \$694,000.

5 Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland:
6 Research, development, and test facilities, \$601,000.

7 SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

8 Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Troop housing,
9 \$14,200,000.

10 Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Vir-
11 ginia: Operational and training facilities, \$1,184,000.

12 Naval Receiving Station, District of Columbia: Opera-
13 tional facilities, \$650,000.

14 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Opera-
15 tional and training facilities, \$1,368,000.

16 Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island: Opera-
17 tional and training facilities, \$273,000.

18 Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia: Opera-
19 tional and training facilities, \$4,643,000.

20 Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Opera-
21 tional and training facilities, \$4,199,000.

1 MEDICAL FACILITIES

2 National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland:
3 Hospital and medical facilities, \$8,503,000.

4 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

5 Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine:
6 Operational and training facilities, and utilities and ground
7 improvements, \$38,654,000.

8 OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

9 Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Re-
10 search, development, and test facilities, \$192,000.

11 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

12 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

13 Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory
14 of Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, \$159,000.

15 AVIATION FACILITIES

16 Naval Air Station, Agana, Mariana Islands: Operational
17 and training facilities, and real estate, \$4,414,000.

18 Naval Station, Bermuda, British West Indies: Opera-
19 tional and training facilities, \$683,000.

20 Naval Air Station, Ford Island, Territory of Hawaii:
21 Operational and training facilities, \$1,271,000.

22 Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Supply facilities,
23 \$165,000.

24 Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Opera-
25 tional and training facilities, \$3,824,000.

1 SUPPLY FACILITIES

2 Naval Supply Depot, Guam, Mariana Islands: Supply
3 facilities, \$3,060,000.

4 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

5 Naval Communication Unit Number Three, Asmara,
6 Eritrea: Operational and training facilities, \$1,180,000.

7 Naval Radio Facility, Port Lyautey, Morocco: Oper-
8 ational and training facilities, \$519,000.

9 Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Op-
10 erational and training facilities, \$219,000.

11 YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

12 Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities,
13 \$890,000.

14 SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish
15 or develop classified naval installations and facilities by ac-
16 quiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing
17 permanent or temporary public works, including land acqui-
18 sition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equip-
19 ment in the total amount of \$65,001,000.

20 SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or
21 develop naval installations and facilities by proceeding with
22 construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions,
23 new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research
24 and development requirements, or improved production
25 schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that de-

1 ferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military
2 construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with
3 interests of national security, and in connection therewith
4 to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install per-
5 manent or temporary public works, including land acquisi-
6 tion, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment,
7 in the total amount of \$25,000,000: *Provided*, That the
8 Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Com-
9 mittees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of
10 Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision
11 to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work
12 undertaken under this section, including those real estate
13 actions pertaining thereto.

14 SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of
15 section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119,
16 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized
17 to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing
18 for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations
19 by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the pro-
20 visions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assist-
21 ance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other com-
22 modity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

23 Naval Magazine, Cartagena, Spain, 46 units.

24 Naval Magazine, El Ferrol, Spain, 45 units.

25 Naval Air Station, Port Lyautey, Morocco, 330 units.

1 Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Italy, 122 units.

2 (b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of
3 the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as
4 amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to con-
5 struct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at
6 the following locations:

7 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

8 Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, 277 units.

9 Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina,
10 800 units.

11 Naval Facility, Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, 27
12 units.

13 Naval Facility, Centerville, California, 24 units.

14 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas, 225
15 units.

16 Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Caro-
17 lina, 849 units.

18 Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oregon, 24 units.

19 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, 425 units.

20 Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 800 units.

21 Naval Facility, Nantucket, Massachusetts, 19 units.

22 Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500
23 units.

24 Naval Facility, Pacific Beach, Washington, 30 units.

1 Naval Facility, Point Sur, California, 24 units.

2 Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, 550
3 units.

4 Naval Ordnance Missile Test Facility, White Sands
5 Proving Ground, New Mexico, 51 units.

6 Naval Radio Station, Winter Harbor, Maine, 20 units.

7 OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES

8 Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of
9 Hawaii, 1,140 units.

10 Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, Headquarters, Camp H.
11 M. Smith, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 168 units.

12 Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands, 220 units.

13 Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Terri-
14 tory of Hawaii, 650 units.

15 Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii,
16 114 units.

17 Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii,
18 650 units.

19 Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, 676 units.

20 SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Con-
21 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTI-
22 NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

23 Under the subheading "MEDICAL FACILITIES", with
24 respect to the Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Virginia Area, strike

1 out “\$12,815,000” and insert in place thereof “\$13,-
2 979,000”.

3 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
4 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
5 tion 402 the amounts “\$139,143,000” and “\$266,927,000”,
6 and inserting respectively in place thereof “\$140,307,000”,
7 and “\$268,091,000”.

8 SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
9 as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202,
10 “\$70,656,000”, and inserting in place thereof “\$72,785,-
11 000”.

12 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
13 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section
14 502 the amounts “\$70,656,000”, and “\$210,704,000” and
15 inserting respectively in place thereof “\$72,785,000”, and
16 “\$212,833,000”.

17 SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
18 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
19 UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:

20 (1) Under the subheading “MARINE CORPS FACILI-
21 TIES”, with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendle-
22 ton, California, strike out “\$648,000” and insert in place
23 thereof “\$778,000”.

24 (2) Under the subheading “ORDNANCE FACILITIES”,

1 with respect to the Naval Underwater Ordnance Station,
2 Newport, Rhode Island, strike out “\$370,000” and insert
3 in place thereof “\$411,000”.

4 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
5 amended, is amended, under the heading “OUTSIDE CON-
6 TINENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 201, as follows:

7 Under subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES”, with respect
8 to the Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands,
9 by striking out “\$6,525,000” and inserting in place thereof
10 “\$9,063,000” and with respect to the Naval Station,
11 Argentia, Newfoundland, by striking out “\$8,589,800” and
12 inserting in place thereof “\$9,089,800”.

13 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
14 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section
15 502 the amounts “\$308,463,600”, “\$108,365,300”, and
16 “\$575,592,300” and inserting respectively in place thereof
17 “\$308,634,600”, “\$111,403,300”, and “\$578,801,300”.

18 SEC. 208. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Con-
19 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading, “INSIDE
20 THE UNITED STATES” in section 201, as follows:

21 (1) Under the subheading “FLEET BASE FACILITIES”,
22 with respect to the Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island,
23 strike out “\$11,672,000” and insert in place thereof
24 “\$14,601,000”.

25 (2) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES

1 (Naval Air Training Stations)”, with respect to the Naval
 2 Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas, strike out
 3 “\$2,247,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,569,000”; and
 4 with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian,
 5 Mississippi, strike out “\$8,231,000” and insert in place
 6 thereof “\$9,141,000”.

7 (3) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
 8 (Marine Corps Air Stations)”, with respect to the Marine
 9 Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, strike
 10 out “\$170,000” and insert in place thereof “\$273,000”.

11 (4) Under the the subheading “SERVICE SCHOOL FA-
 12 CILITIES”, with respect to the Fleet Air Defense Training
 13 Center, Dam Neck, Virginia, strike out “\$237,000” and
 14 insert in place thereof “\$300,000”, and with respect to the
 15 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, strike out
 16 “\$8,413,000” and insert in place thereof “\$10,613,000”.

17 (5) Under the subheading “MEDICAL FACILITIES”,
 18 with respect to the Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Illinois,
 19 strike out “\$12,730,000” and insert in place thereof
 20 “\$14,754,000”.

21 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 22 amended, is amended by striking out in section 203 “\$85,-
 23 939,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$86,711,000”.

24 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 25 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-

tion 402 the amounts “\$303,453,000”, “\$85,939,000”, and
 “\$451,383,000” and inserting respectively in place thereof
 “\$312,004,000”, “\$86,711,000”, and “\$460,706,000”.

SEC. 209. Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress,
 is amended under the heading “INSIDE THE UNITED
 STATES” in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES (Special
 Purposes Air Stations)”, with respect to the Naval Air Mis-
 sile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, insert before
 “\$7,669,000” the words “and land acquisition,”.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish
 or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring,
 constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing perma-
 nent or temporary public works, including site preparation,
 appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following
 projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Mainte-
 nance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate,
 \$2,649,000.

Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Troop
 housing, \$990,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
2 facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, utilities, and
3 real estate, \$10,749,000.

4 Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North
5 Dakota: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital fa-
6 cilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities,
7 \$4,176,000.

8 K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan:
9 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
10 supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities,
11 troop housing, and utilities, \$10,673,000.

12 Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Community
13 facilities, and utilities, \$229,000.

14 Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan:
15 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
16 supply facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, \$9,948,000.

17 McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, and utilities, \$935,000.

19 Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Mainte-
20 nance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities,
21 troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,721,000.

22 Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Opera-
23 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop
24 housing, and utilities, \$3,689,000.

1 Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Medical
2 facilities, \$122,000.

3 Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Mis-
4 souri: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facili-
5 ties, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and real estate,
6 \$2,799,000.

7 Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan:
8 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and
9 utilities and ground improvements, \$3,579,000.

10 Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach,
11 New York: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

12 Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Troop housing, and
13 ground improvements, \$795,000.

14 Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Opera-
15 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and
16 utilities, \$3,992,000.

17 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
19 facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, and utilities,
20 \$8,696,000.

21 AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

22 Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Mainte-
23 nance facilities, and supply facilities, \$975,000.

1 Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational
2 and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$1,-
3 177,000.

4 Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and
5 training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing,
6 \$1,746,000.

7 Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Utilities,
8 \$157,000.

9 Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania:
10 Supply facilities, \$94,000.

11 McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California:
12 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
13 supply facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, \$1,-
14 560,000.

15 Memphis General Depot, Memphis, Tennessee: Ad-
16 ministrative facilities, \$1,464,000.

17 Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California:
18 Supply facilities, \$658,000.

19 Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania:
20 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
21 medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing,
22 community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$6,169,000.

1 Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational
2 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
3 ties, and utilities, \$4,362,000.

4 Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma:
5 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
6 troop housing, and community facilities, \$5,196,000.

7 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational
8 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research,
9 development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and medical
10 facilities, \$11,037,000.

11 AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

12 Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research,
13 development, and test facilities, and utilities, \$981,000.

14 Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational
15 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development,
16 and test facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and
17 real estate, \$10,109,000.

18 Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico:
19 Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utilities,
20 and real estate, \$1,650,000.

21 Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:
22 Supply facilities, and utilities, \$481,000.

23 Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts:
24 Maintenance facilities, \$165,000.

25 Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational

1 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing,
2 and community facilities, \$2,884,000.

3 AIR TRAINING COMMAND

4 Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational
5 and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities,
6 \$979,000.

7 Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational
8 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
9 utilities, and real estate, \$1,584,000.

10 Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Troop hous-
11 ing, \$640,000.

12 Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Troop hous-
13 ing, \$400,000.

14 Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi:
15 Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$208,000.

16 James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Troop
17 housing, \$750,000.

18 Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Operational
19 and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing,
20 community facilities, and utilities, \$5,000,000.

21 Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance
22 facilities, and utilities, \$441,000.

23 Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Op-
24 erational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utili-
25 ties, \$1,213,000.

1 McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Opera-
2 tional and training facilities, \$2,119,000.

3 Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Mainte-
4 nance facilities, \$358,000.

5 Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance
6 facilities, \$319,000.

7 Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Oper-
8 ational and training facilities, and utilities, \$245,000.

9 Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Oper-
10 ational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop
11 housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

12 Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Supply facili-
13 ties, administrative facilities, and community facilities,
14 \$639,000.

15 Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational
16 and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,770,000.

17 Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational
18 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and
19 ground improvements, and real estate, \$3,081,000.

20 Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Opera-
21 tional and training facilities, and maintenance facilities,
22 \$1,361,000.

CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Troop housing, \$1,805,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$11,763,000.

Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Utilities, \$172,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$18,937,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, \$78,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$3,373,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey:

1 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
2 troop housing, and utilities, \$3,901,000.

3 Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Troop housing,
4 \$423,000.

5 STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

6 Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational
7 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
8 ties, utilities, and real estate, \$4,132,000.

9 Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Oper-
10 ational and training facilities, and utilities, \$3,355,000.

11 Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Opera-
12 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
13 facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, com-
14 munity facilities, and utilities, \$9,766,000.

15 Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational and
16 training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utili-
17 ties, \$5,080,000.

18 Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas:
19 Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,654,000.

20 Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational
21 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing,
22 and utilities, \$7,996,000.

23 Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Opera-
24 tional and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$2,257,000.

25 Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Operational

1 and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities,
2 utilities, and real estate, \$4,578,000.

3 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma:
4 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
5 supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,-
6 734,000.

7 Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi:
8 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and
9 utilities, \$1,939,000.

10 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona:
11 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
12 supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,174,000.

13 Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and
14 training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
15 troop housing, and utilities, \$2,404,000.

16 Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational
17 and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,346,000.

18 Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota:
19 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
20 community facilities, and utilities, \$3,241,000.

21 Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington:
22 Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$4,094,000.

23 Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational
24 and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,
25 and utilities, \$5,660,000.

1 Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Opera-
2 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities
3 and ground improvements, \$1,489,000.

4 Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational
5 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
6 \$4,493,000.

7 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana:
8 Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,
9 \$3,401,000.

10 Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington:
11 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
12 supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,795,000.

13 Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational
14 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community
15 facilities, \$897,000.

16 Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Operational
17 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
18 and utilities, \$4,250,000.

19 Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas:
20 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utili-
21 ties, \$3,463,000.

22 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Opera-
23 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate,
24 \$11,716,000.

1 Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational
2 and training facilities, and utilities, \$3,774,000.

3 MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational
4 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
5 ties, and utilities, \$3,825,000.

6 Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana:
7 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
8 supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,832,000.

9 March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational
10 and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and
11 real estate, \$3,344,000.

12 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home,
13 Idaho: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities,
14 and community facilities, \$1,039,000.

15 Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational
16 and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$3,-
17 265,000.

18 Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire:
19 Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,
20 \$940,000.

21 Pinecastle Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational
22 and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and
23 real estate, \$5,387,000.

1 Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York:
2 Supply facilities, and utilities, \$208,000.

3 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin:
4 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
5 supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and com-
6 munity facilities, \$15,552,000.

7 Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational
8 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,-
9 352,000.

10 Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Opera-
11 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
12 \$2,997,000.

13 Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Opera-
14 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, community
15 facilities, and utilities, \$8,495,000.

16 Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachu-
17 setts: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,345,000.

18 Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri: Op-
19 erational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and
20 real estate, \$5,185,000.

21 TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

22 George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Mainte-
23 nance facilities, \$536,000.

1 Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Maintenance
2 facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,371,000.

3 Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South
4 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance
5 facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,650,000.

6 Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Troop
7 housing, \$591,000.

8 Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North
9 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities,
10 troop housing, and utilities, \$4,858,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,339,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,474,000.

18 SPECIAL FACILITIES

19 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
20 \$563,000.

21 AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

22 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
23 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities,

1 administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, com-
2 munity facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$169,962,000.

3 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

4 AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

5 Various locations: Supply facilities, \$500,000.

6 ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

7 Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training facili-
8 ties, \$380,000.

9 Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training
10 facilities, \$710,000.

11 King Salmon Airport: Operational and training facili-
12 ties, \$340,000.

13 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
14 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities,
15 administrative facilities, troop housing, community facili-
16 ties, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate,
17 \$21,495,000.

18 CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

19 Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and
20 training facilities, \$1,540,000.

21 MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

22 Various locations: Maintenance facilities, supply facili-
23 ties, community facilities, and utilities, \$5,347,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$144,000.

Midway Island: Supply facilities, \$839,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$14,454,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,508,000.

Ramsey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,470,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$23,048,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$17,172,000.

1 AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

2 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
3 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities,
4 administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, com-
5 munity facilities, and utilities, \$29,135,000.

6 SPECIAL FACILITIES

7 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
8 \$588,000.

9 SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may estab-
10 lish or develop classified military installations and facilities
11 by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or in-
12 stalling permanent or temporary public works, including
13 land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities,
14 and equipment as follows:

15 (a) Ballistic missiles, \$165,900,000.

16 (b) Strategic missiles, \$29,600,000.

17 (c) Defense missiles, \$122,000,000.

18 SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may estab-
19 lish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by pro-
20 ceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air
21 Force missions, new weapons developments, new and
22 unforeseen research and development requirements, for im-
23 proved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense de-
24 termines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in
25 the next military construction authorization Act would be

1 inconsistent with interests of national security, and in con-
2 nection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabili-
3 tate, or install permanent or temporary public works, includ-
4 ing land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, util-
5 ities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$25,000,000:
6 *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his desig-
7 nee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the
8 Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon
9 reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of con-
10 struction of any public work undertaken under this section,
11 including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

12 SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of sec-
13 tion 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119,
14 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is author-
15 ized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family
16 housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following
17 locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to
18 the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and
19 Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other
20 commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Cor-
21 poration:

22 Lajes Field, Azores, 306 units.

23 Kindley Air Force Base, Bermuda, 300 units.

24 Laon, France, 102 units.

25 Keflavik Airport, Iceland, 300 units.

- 1 Benguerir Air Base, Morocco, 248 units.
- 2 Sidi Slimane Air Base, Morocco, 295 units.
- 3 Clark Air Force Base, Philippines, 900 units.
- 4 Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, 200 units.
- 5 Madrid-Torrejon Area, Spain, 460 units.
- 6 Moron-San Pablo Area, Spain, 40 units.
- 7 Various locations, Spain, 120 units.
- 8 Zaragoza Air Base, Spain, 176 units.
- 9 Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 50 units.
- 10 Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 190 units.
- 11 Bruntingthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 93
- 12 units.
- 13 Brize Norton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 215 units.
- 14 Chelveston RAF Station, United Kingdom, 79 units.
- 15 Chicksands Priory RAF Station, United Kingdom, 83
- 16 units.
- 17 Fairford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 177 units.
- 18 High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 110
- 19 units.
- 20 Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 55
- 21 units.
- 22 Stansted-Mountfitchet RAF Station, United Kingdom,
- 23 22 units.
- 24 Upper Heyford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 259
- 25 units.

1 Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, 416
2 units.

3 (b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of
4 the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as
5 amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to
6 construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters
7 at the following locations:

8 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

9 Adair Air Force Base, Oregon, 150 units.
10 Amarillo Air Force Base, Texas, 500 units.
11 Beale Air Force Base, California, 570 units.
12 Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 250 units.
13 Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, 450 units.
14 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 50 units.
15 Cooke Air Force Base, California, 525 units.
16 Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 500 units.
17 Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 530 units.
18 Duluth Municipal Airport, Minnesota, 240 units.
19 Edwards Air Force Base, California, 778 units.
20 Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 220 units.
21 Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington, 250 units.
22 Forbes Air Force Base, Kansas, 414 units.
23 Fort Custer Air Force Station, Michigan, 169 units.
24 Fort Lee Air Force Station, Virginia, 154 units.
25 Geiger Field, Washington, 168 units.

- 1 Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 460 units.
- 2 Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 744 units.
- 3 Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, 730 units.
- 4 Hamilton Air Force Base, California, 550 units.
- 5 Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, 400 units.
- 6 James Connally Air Force Base, Texas, 366 units.
- 7 Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 290 units.
- 8 Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 475 units.
- 9 K. I. Sawyer Airport, Michigan, 935 units.
- 10 Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, 490 units.
- 11 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Louisiana, 300 units.
- 12 Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, 500 units.
- 13 Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 200 units.
- 14 Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Massachusetts, 395 units.
- 15 Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebraska, 600 units.
- 16 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio, 400 units.
- 17 Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 150 units.
- 18 Mather Air Force Base, California, 220 units.
- 19 McChord Air Force Base, Washington, 1,000 units.
- 20 McClellan Air Force Base, California, 540 units.
- 21 McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, 490 units.
- 22 McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, 1,750 units.
- 23 Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 932 units.
- 24 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 270 units.
- 25 Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, 200 units.

- 1 Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, New York, 290 units.
- 2 Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 616 units
- 3 Oxnard Air Force Base, California, 315 units.
- 4 Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, 483 units.
- 5 Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.
- 6 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wisconsin, 900 units.
- 7 Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Missouri, 610 units.
- 8 Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, 423 units.
- 9 Selfridge Air Force Base, Michigan, 580 units.
- 10 Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas, 500 units.
- 11 Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa, 235 units.
- 12 Stewart Air Force Base, New York, 300 units.
- 13 Suffolk County Air Force Base, New York, 220 units.
- 14 Syracuse Air Force Station, New York, 216 units.
- 15 Topsham Air Force Station, Maine, 177 units.
- 16 Truax Field, Wisconsin, 280 units.
- 17 Turner Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units.
- 18 United States Air Force Academy, Colorado, 1,500
- 19 units.
- 20 Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 230 units.
- 21 Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts, 310 units.
- 22 Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 154 units.
- 23 Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, 150 units.
- 24 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 618 units.

1 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

2 Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, 1,050 units.

3 Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, 600 units.

4 (c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404

5 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652),

6 as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized

7 to acquire family housing at the following locations:

8 Brookley Air Force Base, Alabama, 175 units.

9 Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, 600 units.

10 Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 225 units.

11 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, 550 units.

12 Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, 500

13 units.

14 Hunter Air Force Base, Georgia, 500 units.

15 Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, 592 units.

16 Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, 480 units.

17 March Air Force Base, California, 644 units.

18 Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, 250 units.

19 Mitchel Air Force Base, New York, 628 units.

20 Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, 612 units.

21 Reese Air Force Base, Texas, 418 units.

22 Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, 400 units.

23 Walker Air Force Base, New Mexico, 800 units.

24 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, 2,000 units.

25 SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,

1 as amended, is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL
2 UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

3 Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND", with
4 respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts,
5 strike out "\$6,076,000", and insert in place thereof "\$6,-
6 522,000".

7 Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND",
8 with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton,
9 Ohio, strike out "\$14,508,000" and insert in place thereof
10 "\$15,800,000".

11 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
12 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section
13 502 the amounts "\$824,300,000" and "\$1,363,189,000"
14 and inserting in place thereof "\$826,038,000" and "\$1,364,-
15 927,000", respectively.

16 SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Con-
17 gress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE
18 THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

19 Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—

20 (1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport,
21 Duluth, Minnesota, strike out "\$1,469,000" and insert
22 in place thereof "\$1,636,000".

23 (2) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth,
24 Massachusetts, strike out "\$11,577,000" and insert in
25 place thereof "\$13,341,000".

1 Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND",
2 with respect to Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, strike
3 out "\$1,339,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,661,000".

4 Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND", with
5 respect to James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas,
6 strike out "\$4,687,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,301,-
7 000".

8 Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND",
9 with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls,
10 Montana, strike out "\$1,586,000" and insert in place thereof
11 "\$1,726,000".

12 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
13 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
14 tion 402 the amounts "\$811,342,000" and "\$1,447,-
15 950,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$814,349,000" and
16 "\$1,450,957,000", respectively.

17 SEC. 307. (a) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Con-
18 gress, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED
19 STATES" in section 301, as follows:

20 Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—

21 (1) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base,
22 Glasgow, Montana, strike out "\$2,048,000" and insert
23 in place thereof "\$2,390,000".

24 (2) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base,

1 Kansas City, Missouri, strike out “\$1,100,000” and
2 insert in place thereof “\$1,348,000”.

3 (3) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot,
4 North Dakota, strike out “\$6,804,000” and insert in
5 place thereof “\$8,507,000”.

6 (4) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Fal-
7 mouth, Massachusetts, strike out “\$559,000” and in-
8 sert in place thereof “\$615,000”.

9 Under the subheading “AIR MATERIEL COMMAND”,
10 with respect to Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas,
11 strike out “\$899,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,-
12 128,000”.

13 Under the subheading “AIR TRAINING COMMAND”,
14 with respect to Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas,
15 strike out “\$460,000” and insert in place thereof “\$637,-
16 000”.

17 Under the subheading “STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND”—

18 (1) with respect to Barksdale Air Force Base,
19 Shreveport, Louisiana, strike out “\$3,344,000” and
20 insert in place thereof “\$3,633,000”.

21 (2) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marys-
22 ville, California, strike out “\$7,458,000” and insert in
23 place thereof “\$9,087,000”.

24 (3) with respect to MacDill Air Force Base,

1 Tampa, Florida, strike out “\$936,000” and insert in
2 place thereof “\$1,268,000”.

3 (4) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base,
4 Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out “\$2,344,000”
5 and insert in place thereof “\$2,947,000”.

6 (5) with respect to Whiteman Air Force Base,
7 Knob Noster, Missouri, strike out “\$235,000” and insert
8 in place thereof “\$306,000”.

9 (b) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is
10 amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the
11 amounts “\$394,076,000” and “\$601,781,000” and inserting
12 in place thereof “\$399,755,000” and “\$607,460,000”,
13 respectively.

14 SEC. 308. (a) Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Con-
15 gress, is amended under the heading “ALERT AND DISPER-
16 SAL OF STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND FORCES” in section 1, as
17 follows:

18 (1) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base,
19 Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out “\$895,000” and
20 insert in place thereof “\$1,892,000”.

21 (2) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot,
22 North Dakota, strike out “\$867,000” and insert in
23 place thereof “\$1,479,000”.

(3) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out “\$4,380,000” and insert in place thereof “\$5,479,000”.

(4) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out “\$690,000” and insert in place thereof “\$969,000”.

(b) Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended by striking out in section 3 the amount “\$549,-670,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$552,657,000”.

SEC. 309. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure “\$135,425,000” and inserting in place thereof the figure “\$139,797,000”.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities required for advanced research projects and in connection therewith may acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 529; 40 U. S. C. 259, 267), and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations, for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$111,-
491,000; outside the United States, \$9,416,000; section

1 102, \$201,121,000; section 103, \$25,000,000; or a
2 total of \$347,028,000.

3 (2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$194,-
4 677,000; outside the United States, \$16,384,000; sec-
5 tion 202, \$65,001,000; section 203, \$25,000,000; or
6 a total of \$301,062,000.

7 (3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$525,-
8 101,000; outside the United States, \$118,670,000; sec-
9 tion 302, \$317,500,000; section 303, \$25,000,000; or
10 a total of \$986,271,000.

11 (4) for title IV: \$50,000,000.

12 SEC. 503. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II,
13 and III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary
14 concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects in-
15 side the United States and by 10 per centum for projects
16 outside the United States. However, the total cost of all
17 projects in each such title may not be more than the total
18 amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that
19 title.

20 SEC. 504. Any outstanding authority heretofore pro-
21 vided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119),
22 the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of
23 August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991), for the provision of family
24 housing shall be available for the construction of family hous-
25 ing at any installations for which appropriated fund family

1 housing is authorized to be constructed under titles I and
2 III of this Act.

3 SEC. 505. Whenever—

4 (1) the President determines that compliance with
5 section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for
6 contracts made under this Act for the establishment or
7 development of military installations and facilities in
8 foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out
9 of this Act; and

10 (2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller
11 General have agreed upon alternative methods of ade-
12 quately auditing those contracts; the President may
13 exempt those contracts from the requirements of that
14 section.

15 SEC. 506. Contracts made by the United States under
16 this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a com-
17 petitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national
18 security will not be impaired and the award is consistent
19 with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and
20 section 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547,
21 551). The Secretaries of the military departments shall
22 report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the
23 Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all
24 contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the
25 lowest responsible bidder.

1 SEC. 507. As of July 1, 1959, all authorization for
2 military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary
3 of a military department in connection with the establishment
4 or development of military installations and facilities, and all
5 authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained
6 in Acts approved before August 4, 1956, and not superseded
7 or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed,
8 except—

9 (1) authorizations for public works and for appro-
10 priations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in
11 the titles that contain the general provisions;

12 (2) the authorization for public works projects as
13 to which appropriated funds have been obligated for
14 construction contracts or land acquisition in whole or
15 in part before July 1, 1959, and authorizations for
16 appropriations therefor;

17 (3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for
18 family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is
19 contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952
20 (66 Stat. 606, 622) ;

21 (4) the authorizations for public works and the
22 appropriation of funds that are contained in sections
23 2231–2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended
24 (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886) ;

25 (5) the authorization for the development of the

1 Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$30,-
2 000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the
3 Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609) ;

4 (6) the authorization for development of classified
5 facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained
6 in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951
7 (65 Stat. 336, 343) ;

8 (7) the authorization for public works and for the
9 appropriation of funds that are contained in the Act
10 of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended; and

11 (8) notwithstanding the provision of section 506
12 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 558),
13 the authorization for:

14 (a) jet engine test cells in the amount of
15 \$1,850,000 at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk,
16 Virginia, that is contained in title II, section 201,
17 under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED
18 STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES"
19 of the Act of August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 440, 442),
20 as amended;

21 (b) ammunition storage facilities in the amount
22 of \$225,000 at the Naval Auxiliary Air Station,
23 El Centro, California; navigational aids in the
24 amount of \$590,000 at the Marine Corps Air
25 Station, El Toro, California; research and develop-

1 ment facilities in the amount of \$1,804,000 at the
2 Naval Air Turbine Test Station, Trenton, New
3 Jersey; and navigational aids in the amount of
4 \$400,000 at the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Is-
5 land, Washington: that are contained in title II,
6 section 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL
7 UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION
8 FACILITIES" of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat.
9 535, 540), as amended;

10 (c) the development of aviation ordnance facil-
11 ities in the amount of \$2,638,000 that is contained
12 in title II, section 202, of the Act of July 27, 1954
13 (68 Stat. 535, 543), as amended.

14 SEC. 508. Section 408 (b) of the Act of June 17, 1950
15 (64 Stat. 236, 245), is hereby repealed.

16 SEC. 509. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955
17 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read
18 as follows:

19 "SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1958 through and in-
20 cluding 1961, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air
21 Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities
22 at or near military tactical installations for assignment as
23 public quarters to military personnel and their dependents,
24 if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the
25 Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of

1 adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical
2 installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a
3 family or individual unit basis and not more than five thou-
4 sand of such units may be so leased at any one time.
5 Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may
6 be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and
7 operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such
8 unit.”

9 SEC. 510. Section 406 of the Act of August 3, 1956
10 (70 Stat. 991, 1015), is amended to read as follows:

11 “SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of a military department
12 may acquire any interest in land that—

13 “(1) he or his designee determines is needed in the
14 interest of national defense; and

15 “(2) does not cost more than \$25,000 (exclusive
16 of administrative costs and the amounts of any deficiency
17 judgments).

18 This section does not authorize the acquisition, as part of
19 the same project, of two or more contiguous parcels of land
20 that together cost more than \$25,000.”

21 SEC. 511. Section 408 (a) of the Act of August 3,
22 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), is amended by adding the fol-
23 lowing new subsection at the end thereof:

1 “(5) No determination that a project is urgently re-
2 quired shall be necessary for projects, the cost of which is
3 not in excess of \$5,000.”

4 SEC. 512. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act of
5 August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), is amended to read
6 as follows:

7 “(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law,
8 and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be
9 contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installa-
10 tions or activities unless the actual number of units involved
11 has been specifically authorized by an annual military con-
12 struction authorization Act except (1) housing units re-
13 quired to be acquired pursuant to the provisions of section
14 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) housing units
15 leased, utilizing available operation and maintenance appro-
16 priations, for terms of one year, whether renewable or not,
17 or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the
18 provisions of section 417 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70
19 Stat. 991, 1018) ; and (3) rental guaranty family housing
20 authorized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952
21 (66 Stat. 606, 622) .

22 SEC. 513. (a) Section 2662, title 10, United States
23 Code, is repealed.

1 (b) The analysis of chapter 159, title 10, United States
2 Code, is amended by striking out the following item:

“2662. Real property transactions: agreement with Armed Services Com-
mittees; reports.”

3 (c) Section 43 of the Act of August 10, 1956 (70A
4 Stat. 636), is repealed.

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

By Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. SAVONSTALL

MAY 6, 1958

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Armed Services

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 12360

H. R. 12360

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 6, 1958

Mr. VINSON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and
for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

1 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

2 TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

3 (Ordnance Corps)

4 Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing,
5 and utilities, \$2,697,000.

6 Detroit Arsenal, Michigan: Administrative facilities,
7 \$5,666,000.

8 Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Administrative facilities,
9 troop housing, and utilities, \$8,529,000.

10 Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois: Operational and training
11 facilities, \$570,000.

12 White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico: Operational
13 and training facilities, research, development and test facili-
14 ties, medical facilities, troop housing, and community
15 facilities, \$7,931,000.

16 (Quartermaster Corps)

17 Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational and training facilities,
18 and troop housing, \$4,630,000.

19 (Chemical Corps)

20 Army Chemical Center, Maryland: Troop housing, and
21 utilities, \$2,051,000.

22 Fort Detrick, Maryland: Research, development, and
23 test facilities, and troop housing \$1,077,000.

24 Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Research, develop-
25 ment, and test facilities, \$250,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$3,598,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Army Map Service, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, \$1,913,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,634,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Troop housing, \$862,000.

FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, \$171,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Troop housing and utilities, \$3,749,000.

(Second Army Area)

Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: Hospital facilities, family housing, and real estate, \$2,274,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$516,000.

1 Fort Meade, Maryland: Operational and training facili-
2 ties, \$498,000.

3 Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Supply facilities, \$43,000.

4 (Third Army Area)

5 Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational and training facili-
6 ties, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop
7 housing, and family housing, \$4,189,000.

8 Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and training
9 facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,122,000.

10 Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational and training fa-
11 cilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and admin-
12 istrative facilities, \$847,000.

13 Fort McClellan, Alabama: Operational and training
14 facilities, and hospital facilities, \$3,505,000.

15 Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facili-
16 ties, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop
17 housing, and utilities, \$2,826,000.

18 (Fourth Army Area)

19 Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities,
20 maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$13,734,-
21 000.

22 Fort Hood, Texas: Operational and training facilities,
23 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
24 ties, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,984,000.

25 Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities,

1 maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities,
2 \$3,227,000.

3 (Fifth Army Area)

4 Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Troop housing, and
5 family housing, \$783,000.

6 Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Operational and training
7 facilities, and troop housing, \$1,076,000.

8 Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational and training facilities,
9 and utilities, \$1,084,000.

10 (Sixth Army Area)

11 Baywood Park, California: Real estate, \$144,000.

12 Camp Desert Rock, Nevada: Maintenance facilities,
13 troop housing, and utilities, \$2,892,000.

14 Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational and training
15 facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,085,000.

16 Fort Ord, California: Operational and training facilities,
17 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-
18 munity facilities, and utilities, \$4,733,000.

19 Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Operational and training
20 facilities, \$173,000.

21 (Military Academy)

22 United States Military Academy, West Point, New
23 York: Troop housing, medical facilities, and community
24 facilities, \$5,844,000.

1 (Armed Forces Special Weapons)

2 Various locations: Maintenance facilities, community
3 facilities, and utilities, \$273,000.

4 (Tactical Installations Support Facilities)

5 Various locations: Maintenance facilities, \$6,311,000.

6 OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

7 (Alaskan Area)

8 Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training fa-
9 cilities, \$222,000.

10 Fairbanks Permafrost Research Area: Real estate,
11 \$7,000.

12 (Pacific Command Area)

13 Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: Operational and training fa-
14 cilities, \$240,000.

15 Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Troop housing, \$593,000.

16 Fort Shafter, Hawaii: Supply facilities, maintenance
17 facilities, family housing, and community facilities, \$2,-
18 925,000.

19 Korea: Operational and training facilities, supply facili-
20 ties, and utilities, \$904,000.

21 (Caribbean Command Area)

22 Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: Maintenance facilities,
23 \$462,000.

(United States Army, Europe)

France: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,063,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$201,121,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$25,000,000: *Provided*, That the Sec-

1 retary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Com-
2 mittees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of
3 Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision
4 to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work
5 undertaken under this section, including those real estate
6 actions pertaining thereto.

7 SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of
8 section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119,
9 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized
10 to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing
11 for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations
12 by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the pro-
13 visions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assist-
14 ance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other com-
15 modity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

16 Various locations, France, 298 units.

17 Vicenza, Italy, 371 units.

18 Army Security Agency, location 13, 91 units.

19 Gateway Communications Station, 174 units.

20 (b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of
21 the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as
22 amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to con-
23 struct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at
24 the following locations:

1 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

- 2 Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, 316 units.
- 3 Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York, 120 units.
- 4 White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico, 275 units.
- 5 Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, 130 units.
- 6 Fort Lee, Virginia, 435 units.
- 7 Natick R&E, Massachusetts, 35 units.
- 8 Fort Belvoir, Virginia, 618 units.
- 9 Two Rock Ranch Station, California, 25 units.
- 10 Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 50 units.
- 11 Beaumont Army Hospital, Texas, 125 units.
- 12 Fort Dix, New Jersey, 702 units.
- 13 Fort Totten, New York, 130 units.
- 14 Fort Bragg, North Carolina, 367 units.
- 15 Fort Campbell, Kentucky, 837 units.
- 16 Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois, 65 units.
- 17 Fort Rucker, Alabama, 400 units.
- 18 Fort Carson, Colorado, 200 units.
- 19 Fort Stewart, Georgia, 73 units.
- 20 Fort Bliss, Texas, 410 units.
- 21 Fort Hood, Texas, 500 units.
- 22 Fort Sam Houston, Texas, 183 units.
- 23 Fort Sill, Oklahoma, 349 units.

- 1 Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 700 units.
- 2 Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, 200 units.
- 3 Fort Sheridan, Illinois, 50 units.
- 4 Forts Baker and Barry, California, 98 units.
- 5 Oakland Army Terminal, California, 88 units.
- 6 Fort Lewis, Washington, 1,231 units.
- 7 Branch United States Disciplinary Barracks, California,
- 8 160 units.
- 9 United States Military Academy, New York, 156 units.
- 10 Bossier Base, Louisiana, 200 units.
- 11 Fort Eustis, Virginia, 223 units.
- 12 Medina Base, Texas, 125 units.
- 13 Sandia Base, New Mexico, 213 units.
- 14 Army Air Defense Command Stations, 492 units.

15 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

- 16 Canal Zone, 330 units.
- 17 Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, 385 units.
- 18 Fort Shafter, Hawaii, 481 units.
- 19 SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress,
- 20 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
- 21 UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:
- 22 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICE FACILI-

1 TIES (Ordnance Corps)”, with respect to Pueblo Ordnance
2 Depot, Colorado, strike out “\$563,000” and insert in place
3 thereof “\$600,000”.

4 (b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as
5 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
6 tion 502 the amounts “\$44,407,000” and “\$134,075,000”
7 and inserting in place thereof “\$44,444,000” and “\$134,-
8 112,000”, respectively.

9 SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-
10 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTI-
11 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

12 (1) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-
13 CILITIES (Ordnance Corps)”, with respect to Redstone
14 Arsenal, Alabama, strike out “\$2,865,000” and insert in
15 place thereof “\$4,180,000”.

16 (2) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-
17 CILITIES (Signal Corps)” with respect to Fort Monmouth,
18 New Jersey, strike out “\$615,000” and insert in place
19 thereof “\$731,000”; and with respect to Vint Hill Farms
20 Station, Virginia, strike out “\$695,000” and insert in place
21 thereof “\$1,022,000”.

22 (3) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-

1 CILITIES (Corps of Engineers)", with respect to Granite
2 City Engineer Depot, Illinois, strike out "\$1,822,000" and
3 insert in place thereof "\$2,815,000".

4 (4) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-
5 CILITIES (Medical Corps)", with respect to Walter Reed
6 Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, strike out "\$4,-
7 472,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,714,000".

8 (5) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
9 (Second Army Area)", with respect to Fort George G.
10 Meade, Maryland, strike out "\$923,000" and insert in place
11 thereof "\$1,264,000".

12 (6) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
13 (Fourth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas,
14 strike out "\$4,645,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,-
15 965,000"; and with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike
16 out "\$3,053,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,454,000".

17 (7) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
18 (Sixth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Ord, California,
19 strike out "\$1,407,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,-
20 742,000".

21 (8) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
22 (Military Academy)", with respect to the United States
23 Military Academy, New York, strike out "\$756,000" and
24 insert in place thereof "\$1,171,000".

25 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as

1 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
2 502 the amounts “\$237,320,000” and “\$546,387,000” and
3 inserting in place thereof “\$244,125,000” and “\$553,192,-
4 000”, respectively.

5 SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
6 as amended, is amended under the heading “INSIDE THE
7 UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

8 (1) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
9 FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)”, with respect to White
10 Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico, strike out “\$693,000”
11 and insert in place thereof “\$735,000”.

12 (2) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
13 FACILITIES (Chemical Corps)”, with respect to Camp
14 Detrick, Maryland, strike out “\$913,000” and insert in place
15 thereof “\$1,074,000”; and with respect to Dugway Proving
16 Ground, Utah, strike out “\$867,000” and insert in place
17 thereof “\$1,044,000”.

18 (3) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
19 FACILITIES (Signal Corps)”, with respect to Fort Hua-
20 chuca, Arizona, strike out “\$6,856,000” and insert in place
21 thereof “\$7,576,000”.

22 (4) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
23 FACILITIES (Corps of Engineers)”, with respect to Fort
24 Belvoir, Virginia, strike out “\$492,000” and insert in place
25 thereof “\$940,000”.

1 (5) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
2 FACILITIES (Transportation Corps)”, with respect to Fort
3 Eustis, Virginia, strike out “\$1,231,000” and insert in place
4 thereof “\$1,436,000”.

5 (6) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
6 (First Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Dix, New Jersey,
7 strike out “\$54,000” and insert in place thereof “\$68,000”.

8 (7) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
9 (Second Army Area)”, with respect to Fort George G.
10 Meade, Maryland, strike out “\$5,885,000” and insert in
11 place thereof “\$7,695,000”.

12 (8) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
13 (Third Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Benning,
14 Georgia, strike out “\$422,000” and insert in place thereof
15 “\$616,000”; and with respect to Fort McClellan, Alabama,
16 strike out “\$397,000” and insert in place thereof
17 “\$527,000”.

18 (9) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
19 (Fourth Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Hood, Texas,
20 strike out “\$2,457,000” and insert in place thereof
21 “\$2,846,000”.

22 (10) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILI-
23 TIES (Fifth Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Riley,
24 Kansas, strike out “\$1,519,000” and insert in place thereof
25 “\$1,892,000”.

1 (11) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILI-
2 TIES (Sixth Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Lewis,
3 Washington, strike out “\$3,022,000” and insert in place
4 thereof “\$3,596,000”; and with respect to Fort Ord, Cali-
5 fornia, strike out “\$223,000” and insert in place thereof
6 “\$319,000”.

7 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
8 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE THE
9 UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

10 Under the subheading “(Alaskan Area)”, with re-
11 spect to Wildwood Station (Kenai), strike out “\$352,000”
12 and insert in place thereof “\$516,000”.

13 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
14 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
15 tion 402 the amounts “\$95,010,000”, “\$35,763,000”, and
16 “\$334,104,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$100,-
17 343,000”, “\$35,927,000”, and “\$339,601,000”, respec-
18 tively.

19 SEC. 108. (a) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Con-
20 gress, is amended under the heading “INSIDE THE UNITED
21 STATES” in section 101 as follows:

22 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACIL-
23 ITIES (Corps of Engineers)” with respect to Cold Regions
24 Laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire, strike out “\$2,496,-
25 000” and insert in place thereof “\$3,787,000”.

(b) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$115,624,000" and "\$293,103,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$116,915,000" and "\$294,394,000".

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Facility, Cape May, New Jersey: Operational and training facilities, \$141,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Operational and training facilities, \$500,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Operational and training facilities, \$2,247,000.

Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California: Operational and training facilities, \$766,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,709,000.

1 Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational and train-
2 ing facilities, \$2,546,000.

3 AVIATION FACILITIES

4 (Naval Air Training Stations)

5 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi:
6 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
7 supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community
8 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
9 \$14,940,000.

10 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida:
11 Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground im-
12 provements, and real estate, \$4,679,000.

13 (Fleet Support Air Stations)

14 Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational and
15 training facilities, \$114,000.

16 Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Maintenance
17 facilities, \$1,252,000.

18 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Cali-
19 fornia: Operational and training facilities, \$47,000.

20 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Opera-
21 tional and training facilities, \$80,000.

22 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Fentress, Virginia:
23 Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

1 Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina:
2 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
3 medical facilities, troop housing, administrative facilities, and
4 utilities and ground improvements, \$11,215,000.

5 Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational
6 and training facilities, \$74,000.

7 Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and
8 training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, admin-
9 istrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground
10 improvements, \$15,823,000.

11 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Opera-
12 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, community fa-
13 cilities, utilities, and real estate, \$9,892,000.

14 Naval Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field, Florida:
15 Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

16 (Marine Corps Air Stations)

17 Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South
18 Carolina: Operational and training facilities and real estate,
19 \$4,352,000.

20 Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Caro-
21 lina: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,
22 \$1,067,000.

23 Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina:
24 Operational and training facilities, \$1,003,000.

1 Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California:
2 Operational and training facilities, \$2,158,000.

3 (Special Purpose Air Stations)

4 Naval Air Facility, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp
5 Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, main-
6 tenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities,
7 troop housing, utilities, and operational and training facilities
8 and real estate at the Naval Auxiliary Landing Field,
9 Webster Field, Maryland, \$18,521,000.

10 Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California:
11 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
12 research, development and test facilities, supply facilities,
13 and troop housing (including operational and training facili-
14 ties and troop housing on San Nicolas Island; and mainte-
15 nance facilities, research, development and test facilities,
16 supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground
17 improvements at Camp Cooke), \$13,841,000.

18 SUPPLY FACILITIES

19 Naval Supply Depot, Newport, Rhode Island: Utilities,
20 \$2,210,000.

21 Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Administrative
22 facilities, \$128,000.

23 Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California: Administra-
24 tive facilities, \$146,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California:
Operational and training facilities, \$280,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina:
Utilities, \$462,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,138,000.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$168,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California:
Utilities, \$206,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California:
Maintenance facilities, \$241,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California:
Supply facilities, \$129,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord, California: Maintenance facilities, \$2,517,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, California: Research, development, and test facilities, \$510,000.

Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Virginia: Research, development, and test facilities, \$44,000.

1 Naval Ammunition Depot, Hingham, Massachusetts:
2 Maintenance facilities, \$694,000.

3 Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland:
4 Research, development, and test facilities, \$601,000.

5 SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

6 Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Troop housing,
7 \$14,200,000.

8 Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Vir-
9 ginia: Operational and training facilities, \$1,184,000.

10 Naval Receiving Station, District of Columbia: Opera-
11 tional facilities, \$650,000.

12 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Opera-
13 tional and training facilities, \$1,368,000.

14 Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island: Opera-
15 tional and training facilities, \$273,000.

16 Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia: Opera-
17 tional and training facilities, \$4,643,000.

18 Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Opera-
19 tional and training facilities, \$4,199,000.

20 MEDICAL FACILITIES

21 National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland:
22 Hospital and medical facilities, \$8,503,000.

23 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

24 Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Oper-

1 ational and training facilities, and utilities and ground im-
2 provements, \$38,654,000.

3 OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

4 Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Re-
5 search, development, and test facilities, \$192,000.

6 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

7 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

8 Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory
9 of Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, \$159,000.

10 AVIATION FACILITIES

11 Naval Air Station, Agana, Mariana Islands: Opera-
12 tional and training facilities, and real estate, \$4,414,000.

13 Naval Station, Bermuda, British West Indies: Opera-
14 tional and training facilities, \$683,000.

15 Naval Air Station, Ford Island, Territory of Hawaii:
16 Operational and training facilities, \$1,271,000.

17 Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Supply facilities,
18 \$165,000.

19 Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Opera-
20 tional and training facilities, \$3,824,000.

21 SUPPLY FACILITIES

22 Naval Supply Depot, Guam, Mariana Islands: Supply
23 facilities, \$3,060,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Communication Unit Number Three, Asmara, Eritrea: Operational and training facilities, \$1,180,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Port Lyautey, Morocco: Operational and training facilities, \$519,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Operational and training facilities, \$219,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$890,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$65,001,000.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop naval installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military

1 construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with
2 interests of national security, and in connection therewith to
3 acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent
4 or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
5 preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the
6 total amount of \$25,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary
7 of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on
8 Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives
9 immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of
10 the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under
11 this section, including those real estate actions pertaining
12 thereto.

13 SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of
14 section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119,
15 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized
16 to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing
17 for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations
18 by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the pro-
19 visions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance
20 Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity
21 transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

22 Naval Magazine, Cartagena, Spain, 46 units.

23 Naval Magazine, El Ferrol, Spain, 45 units.

24 Naval Air Station, Port Lyautey, Morocco, 330 units.

1 Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Italy, 122 units.

2 (b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the
3 Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended,
4 the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct fami-
5 ly housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following
6 locations:

7 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

8 Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, 277 units.

9 Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina,
10 800 units.

11 Naval Facility, Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, 27 units.

12 Naval Facility, Centerville, California, 24 units.

13 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas, 225
14 units.

15 Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina,
16 849 units.

17 Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oregon, 24 units.

18 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, 425 units.

19 Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 800 units.

20 Naval Facility, Nantucket, Massachusetts, 19 units.

21 Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500
22 units.

23 Naval Facility, Pacific Beach, Washington, 30 units.

1 Naval Facility, Point Sur, California, 24 units.

2 Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, 550
3 units.

4 Naval Ordnance Missile Test Facility, White Sands
5 Proving Grounds.

6 New Mexico, 51 units.

7 Naval Radio Station, Winter Harbor, Maine, 20 units.

8 OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES

9 Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of
10 Hawaii, 1,140 units.

11 Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, Headquarters, Camp H. M.
12 Smith, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 168 units.

13 Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands, 220 units.

14 Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Terri-
15 tory of Hawaii, 650 units.

16 Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii,
17 114 units.

18 Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii,
19 650 units.

20 Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, 676 units.

21 SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Con-
22 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTI-
23 NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

24 Under the subheading "MEDICAL FACILITIES", with re-
25 spect to the Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Virginia Area, strike

1 out “\$12,815,000” and insert in place thereof “\$13,979,-
2 000”.

3 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
4 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section
5 402 the amounts “\$139,143,000” and “\$266,927,000”, and
6 inserting respectively in place thereof “\$140,307,000”, and
7 “\$268,091,000”.

8 SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
9 as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202,
10 “\$70,656,000”, and inserting in place thereof “\$72,785,-
11 000”.

12 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
13 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section
14 502 the amounts “\$70,656,000”, and “\$210,704,000” and
15 inserting respectively in place thereof “\$72,785,000”, and
16 “\$212,833,000”.

17 SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
18 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
19 UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:

20 (1) Under the subheading “MARINE CORPS FACIL-
21 ITIES”, with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pen-
22 dleton, California, strike out “\$648,000” and insert in place
23 thereof “\$778,000”.

24 (2) Under the subheading “ORDNANCE FACILITIES”,
25 with respect to the Naval Underwater Ordnance Station,

1 Newport, Rhode Island, strike out “\$370,000” and insert
2 in place thereof “\$411,000”.

3 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
4 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CONTI-
5 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 201, as follows:

6 Under subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES”, with re-
7 spect to the Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Is-
8 lands, by striking out “\$6,525,000” and inserting in place
9 thereof “\$9,063,000” and with respect to the Naval Station,
10 Argentia, Newfoundland, by striking out “\$8,589,800” and
11 inserting in place thereof “\$9,089,800”.

12 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
13 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
14 tion 502 the amounts “\$308,463,600”, “\$108,365,000”, and
15 “\$575,592,300” and inserting respectively in place thereof
16 “\$308,634,600”, “\$111,403,300”, and “\$578,801,300”.

17 SEC. 208. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Con-
18 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading “INSIDE
19 THE UNITED STATES” in section 201, as follows:

20 (1) Under the subheading “FLEET BASE FACILITIES”,
21 with respect to the Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island,
22 strike out “\$11,672,000” and insert in place thereof
23 “\$14,601,000”.

24 (2) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
25 (Naval Air Training Stations)”, with respect to the Naval

1 Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas, strike out
 2 “\$2,247,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,569,000”;
 3 and with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Merid-
 4 ian, Mississippi, strike out “\$8,231,000” and insert in place
 5 thereof “\$9,141,000”.

6 (3) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
 7 (Marine Corps Air Stations)”, with respect to the Marine
 8 Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, strike out
 9 “\$170,000” and insert in place thereof “\$273,000”.

10 (4) Under the subheading “SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
 11 TIES”, with respect to the Fleet Air Defense Training
 12 Center, Dam Neck, Virginia, strike out “\$237,000” and
 13 insert in place thereof “\$300,000”, and with respect to the
 14 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, strike out
 15 “\$8,413,000” and insert in place thereof “\$10,613,000”.

16 (5) Under the subheading “MEDICAL FACILITIES”,
 17 with respect to the Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Illinois,
 18 strike out “\$12,730,000” and insert in place thereof
 19 “\$14,754,000”.

20 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 21 amended, is amended by striking out in section 203
 22 “\$85,939,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$86,711,000”.

23 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 24 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
 25 tion 402 the amounts “\$303,453,000”, “\$85,939,000”, and

1 “\$451,383,000” and inserting respectively in place thereof
 2 “\$312,004,000”, “\$86,711,000”, and “\$460,706,000”.

3 SEC. 209. Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress,
 4 is amended under the heading “INSIDE THE UNITED
 5 STATES” in section 201 as follows:

6 Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES (Special
 7 Purpose Air Stations)”, with respect to the Naval Air
 8 Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, insert before
 9 “\$7,669,000” the words “and land acquisition,”.

10 TITLE III

11 SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish
 12 or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring,
 13 constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing per-
 14 manent or temporary public works, including site prepara-
 15 tion, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the follow-
 16 ing projects:

17 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

18 AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

19 Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Main-
 20 tenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate,
 21 \$2,649,000.

22 Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont:
 23 Troop housing, \$990,000.

24 Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Opera-
 25 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply

1 facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, utilities, and
2 real estate, \$10,749,000.

3 Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North
4 Dakota: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital
5 facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities,
6 \$4,176,000.

7 K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan:
8 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
9 supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities,
10 troop housing, and utilities, \$10,673,000.

11 Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Community
12 facilities, and utilities, \$229,000.

13 Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan:
14 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
15 supply facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, \$9,948,000.

16 McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington:
17 Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$935,000.

18 Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Main-
19 tenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities,
20 troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,721,000.

21 Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Opera-
22 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop
23 housing, and utilities, \$3,689,000.

24 Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Medical
25 facilities, \$122,000.

1 Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri:
2 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
3 supply facilities, administrative facilities, and real estate,
4 \$2,799,000.

5 Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan:
6 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and
7 utilities and ground improvements, \$3,579,000.

8 Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach,
9 New York: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

10 Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Troop housing, and
11 ground improvements, \$795,000.

12 Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Opera-
13 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and
14 utilities, \$3,992,000.

15 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Opera-
16 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
17 facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, and utilities,
18 \$8,696,000.

19 AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

20 Brooklyn Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Mainte-
21 nance facilities, and supply facilities, \$975,000.

22 Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational
23 and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate,
24 \$1,177,000.

25 Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and

1 training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing,
2 \$1,746,000.

3 Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Utilities,
4 \$157,000.

5 Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania:
6 Supply facilities, \$94,000.

7 McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California:
8 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
9 supply facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing,
10 \$1,560,000.

11 Memphis General Depot, Memphis, Tennessee: Admin-
12 istrative facilities, \$1,464,000.

13 Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California:
14 Supply facilities, \$658,000.

15 Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania:
16 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
17 medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing,
18 community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$6,169,000.

19 Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational
20 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
21 and utilities, \$4,362,000.

22 Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma:
23 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
24 troop housing, and community facilities, \$5,196,000.

1 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Oper-
2 ational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, re-
3 search, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and
4 medical facilities, \$11,037,000.

5 AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

6 Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research,
7 development, and test facilities, and utilities, \$981,000.

8 Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational
9 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, de-
10 velopment, and test facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and
11 real estate, \$10,109,000.

12 Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico:
13 Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utili-
14 ties, and real estate, \$1,650,000.

15 Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:
16 Supply facilities, and utilities, \$481,000.

17 Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts:
18 Maintenance facilities, \$165,000.

19 Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational
20 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing,
21 and community facilities, \$2,884,000.

22 AIR TRAINING COMMAND

23 Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational
24 and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities,
25 \$979,000.

1 Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational
2 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
3 ties, utilities, and real estate, \$1,584,000.

4 Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Troop hous-
5 ing, \$640,000.

6 Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Troop hous-
7 ing, \$400,000.

8 Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi:
9 Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$208,000.

10 James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Troop
11 housing, \$750,000.

12 Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Operational
13 and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing,
14 community facilities, and utilities, \$5,000,000.

15 Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance
16 facilities, and utilities, \$441,000.

17 Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Oper-
18 ational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
19 \$1,213,000.

20 McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Opera-
21 tional and training facilities, \$2,119,000.

22 Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Mainte-
23 nance facilities, \$358,000.

24 Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance
25 facilities, \$319,000.

1 Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Oper-
2 ational and training facilities, and utilities, \$245,000.

3 Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Oper-
4 ational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop
5 housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

6 Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Supply facilities,
7 administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$639,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational
and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,770,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$3,081,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,361,000.

16 CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

17 Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Troop
18 housing, \$1,805,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio:
Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
supply facilities, and administrative facilities, troop housing,
community facilities, and utilities, \$11,763,000.

23 Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta; Georgia: Utilities,
24 \$172,000.

1 HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

2 Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland:
3 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
4 supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$18,-
5 937,000.

6 MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

7 Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina:
8 Maintenance facilities, \$78,000.

9 Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational
10 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities,
11 \$3,373,000.

12 McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey:
13 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
14 troop housing, and utilities, \$3,901,000.

15 Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Troop hous-
16 ing, \$423,000.

17 STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

18 Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational
19 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
20 ties, utilities, and real estate, \$4,132,000.

21 Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Op-
22 erational and training facilities, and utilities, \$3,355,000.

23 Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Opera-
24 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply

1 facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, commu-
2 nity facilities, and utilities, \$9,766,000.

3 Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational
4 and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and
5 utilities, \$5,080,000.

6 Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas:
7 Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,654,000.

8 Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational
9 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing,
10 and utilities, \$7,996,000.

11 Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Opera-
12 tional and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$2,-
13 257,000.

14 Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Operational
15 and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities,
16 utilities, and real estate, \$4,578,000.

17 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma:
18 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
19 supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,-
20 734,000.

21 Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Oper-
22 ational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
23 \$1,939,000.

24 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona:

1 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
2 supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,174,000.

3 Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and
4 training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
5 troop housing, and utilities, \$2,404,000.

6 Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational
7 and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,346,000.

8 Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota:
9 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
10 community facilities, and utilities, \$3,241,000.

11 Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington:
12 Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$4,094,000.

13 Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational
14 and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,
15 and utilities, \$5,660,000.

16 Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Opera-
17 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and
18 ground improvements, \$1,489,000.

19 Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational
20 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
21 \$4,493,000.

22 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana:
23 Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,
24 \$3,401,000.

1 Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington:
2 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
3 supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,795,000.

4 Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational
5 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community
6 facilities, \$897,000.

7 Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Operational
8 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
9 ties, and utilities, \$4,250,000.

10 Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas:
11 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utili-
12 ties, \$3,463,000.

13 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Opera-
14 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate,
15 \$11,716,000.

16 Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational
17 and training facilities, and utilities, \$3,774,000.

18 MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational
19 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
20 and utilities, \$3,825,000.

21 Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Op-
22 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
23 facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,832,000.

24 March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and
2 real estate, \$3,344,000.

3 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home,
4 Idaho: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities,
5 and community facilities, \$1,039,000.

6 Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational
7 and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate,
8 \$3,265,000.

9 Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire:
10 Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,
11 \$940,000.

12 Pinecastle Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Opera-
13 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and
14 real estate, \$5,387,000.

15 Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York:
16 Supply facilities, and utilities, \$208,000.

17 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin:
18 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
19 supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and com-
20 munity facilities, \$15,552,000.

21 Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational
22 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,-
23 352,000.

24 Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
2 \$2,997,000.

3 Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, community
5 facilities, and utilities, \$8,495,000.

6 Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachu-
7 setts: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,345,000.

8 Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri: Op-
9 erational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities,
10 and real estate, \$5,185,000.

11 TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

12 George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Main-
13 tenance facilities, \$536,000.

14 Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Mainte-
15 nance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,371,000.

16 Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South
17 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance fa-
18 cilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,650,000.

19 Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Troop
20 housing, \$591,000.

21 Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North
22 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities,
23 troop housing, and utilities, \$4,858,000.

24 Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,-
2 339,000.

3 Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational
4 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
5 ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real
6 estate, \$5,474,000.

7 SPECIAL FACILITIES

8 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
9 \$563,000.

10 AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

11 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
12 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities,
13 administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, com-
14 munity facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$169,962,000.

15 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

16 AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

17 Various locations: Supply facilities, \$500,000.

18 ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

19 Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training
20 facilities, \$380,000.

21 Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training
22 facilities, \$710,000.

23 King Salmon Airport: Operational and training facili-
24 ties, \$340,000.

1 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
2 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities,
3 administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities,
4 utilities and ground improvements, and real estate,
5 \$21,495,000.

6 CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

7 Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and
8 training facilities, \$1,540,000.

9 MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

10 Various locations: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
11 ties, community facilities, and utilities, \$5,347,000.

12 PACIFIC AIR FORCES

13 Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational and training facilities,
14 and supply facilities, \$144,000.

15 Midway Island: Supply facilities, \$839,000.

16 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
17 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities,
18 and utilities, \$14,454,000.

19 STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

20 Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Operational and training facilities,
21 maintenance facilities, and supply facilities,
22 \$1,508,000.

23 Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and
24 training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities,
25 ties, \$1,470,000.

1 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
2 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, family housing, troop
3 housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$23,048,000.

4 UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

5 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
6 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities,
7 administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, com-
8 munity facilities, and utilities, \$17,172,000.

9 AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

10 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
11 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities,
12 administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, com-
13 munity facilities, and utilities, \$29,135,000.

14 SPECIAL FACILITIES

15 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
16 \$588,000.

17 SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish
18 or develop classified military installations and facilities by
19 acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or install-
20 ing permanent or temporary public works, including land
21 acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and
22 equipment as follows:

23 (a) Ballistic missiles, \$165,900,000.

24 (b) Strategic missiles, \$29,600,000.

25 (c) Defense missiles, \$122,000,000.

1 SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish
2 or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceed-
3 ing with construction made necessary by changes in Air
4 Force missions, new weapons developments, new and un-
5 foreseen research and development requirements, or im-
6 proved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense de-
7 termines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in
8 the next military construction authorization Act would be
9 inconsistent with interests of national security, and in con-
10 nection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate,
11 or install permanent or temporary public works, including
12 land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities,
13 and equipment, in the total amount of \$25,000,000: *Pro-*
14 *vided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee,
15 shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate
16 and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching
17 a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of
18 any public work undertaken under this section, including
19 those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

20 SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of
21 section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119,
22 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is author-
23 ized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family
24 housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following
25 locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to

1 the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and
 2 Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other
 3 commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corpora-
 4 tion:

- 5 Lajes Field, Azores, 306 units.
- 6 Kindley Air Force Base, Bermuda, 300 units.
- 7 Laon, France, 102 units.
- 8 Keflavik Airport, Iceland, 300 units.
- 9 Benguerir Airport, Iceland, 248 units.
- 10 Sidi Slimane Air Base, Morocco, 295 units.
- 11 Clark Air Force Base, Philippines, 900 units.
- 12 Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, 200 units.
- 13 Madrid-Torrejon area, Spain, 460 units.
- 14 Moron-San Pablo area, Spain, 40 units.
- 15 Various locations, Spain, 120 units.
- 16 Zaragoza Air Base, Spain, 176 units.
- 17 Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 50 units.
- 18 Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 190 units.
- 19 Bruntingthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 93
 20 units.
- 21 Brize Norton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 215 units.
- 22 Chelveston RAF Station, United Kingdom, 79 units.
- 23 Chicksands Priory RAF Station, United Kingdom, 83
 24 units.
- 25 Fairford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 177 units.

1 High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 110
2 units.

3 Lakenheath-Mildeuham Area, United Kingdom, 55 units.

4 Stansted-Mountfitchet RAF Station, United Kingdom,
5 22 units.

6 Upper Heyford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 259
7 units.

8 Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, 416 units.

9 (b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of
10 the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as
11 amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to
12 construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters
13 at the following locations:

14 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

15 Adair Air Force Base, Oregon, 150 units.

16 Amarillo Air Force Base, Texas, 500 units.

17 Beale Air Force Base, California, 570 units.

18 Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 250 units.

19 Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, 450 units.

20 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 50 units.

21 Cooke Air Force Base, California, 525 units.

22 Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 500 units.

23 Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 530 units.

24 Duluth Municipal Airport, Minnesota, 240 units.

25 Edwards Air Force Base, California, 778 units.

- 1 Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 220 units.
- 2 Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington, 250 units.
- 3 Forbes Air Force Base, Kansas, 414 units.
- 4 Fort Custer Air Force Station, Michigan, 169 units.
- 5 Fort Lee Air Force Station, Virginia, 154 units.
- 6 Geiger Field, Washington, 168 units.
- 7 Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 460 units.
- 8 Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 744 units.
- 9 Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, 730 units.
- 10 Hamilton Air Force Base, California, 550 units.
- 11 Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, 400 units.
- 12 James Connally Air Force Base, Texas, 366 units.
- 13 Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 290 units.
- 14 Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 475 units.
- 15 K. I. Sawyer Airport, Michigan, 935 units.
- 16 Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, 490 units.
- 17 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Louisiana, 300 units.
- 18 Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, 500 units.
- 19 Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 200 units.
- 20 Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Massachusetts, 395 units.
- 21 Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebraska, 600 units.
- 22 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio, 400 units.
- 23 Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 150 units.
- 24 Mather Air Force Base, California, 220 units.
- 25 McChord Air Force Base, Washington, 1,000 units.

- 1 McClellan Air Force Base, California, 540 units.
- 2 McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, 490 units.
- 3 McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, 1,750 units.
- 4 Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 932 units.
- 5 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 270 units.
- 6 Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, 200 units.
- 7 Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, New York, 290 units.
- 8 Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 616 units.
- 9 Oxnard Air Force Base, California, 315 units.
- 10 Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, 483 units.
- 11 Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.
- 12 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wisconsin, 900 units.
- 13 Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Missouri, 610 units.
- 14 Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, 423 units.
- 15 Selfridge Air Force Base, Michigan, 580 units.
- 16 Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas, 500 units.
- 17 Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa, 235 units.
- 18 Stewart Air Force Base, New York, 300 units.
- 19 Suffolk County Air Force Base, New York, 220 units.
- 20 Syracuse Air Force Station, New York, 216 units.
- 21 Topsham Air Force Station, Maine, 177 units.
- 22 Truax Field, Wisconsin, 280 units.
- 23 Turner Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units.
- 24 United States Air Force Academy, Colorado, 1,500
- 25 units.

- 1 Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 230 units.
- 2 Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts, 310 units.
- 3 Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 154 units.
- 4 Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, 150 units.
- 5 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 618 units.

6 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

- 7 Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, 1,050 units.
- 8 Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, 600 units.

9 (c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404
10 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652),
11 as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized
12 to acquire family housing at the following locations:

- 13 Brookley Air Force Base, Alabama, 175 units.
- 14 Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, 600 units.
- 15 Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 225 units.
- 16 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, 550 units.
- 17 Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, 500
18 units.
- 19 Hunter Air Force Base, Georgia, 500 units.
- 20 Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, 592 units.
- 21 Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, 480 units.
- 22 March Air Force Base, California, 644 units.
- 23 Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, 250 units.
- 24 Mitchel Air Force Base, New York, 628 units.

1 Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, 612 units.

2 Reese Air Force Base, Texas, 418 units.

3 Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, 400 units.

4 Walker Air Force Base, New Mexico, 800 units.

5 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, 2,000 units.

6 SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-
7 gress, as amended, is amended, under the heading “CONTI-
8 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

9 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”, with
10 respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts,
11 strike out “\$6,076,000,” and insert in place thereof “\$6,-
12 522,000”.

13 Under the subheading “AIR MATERIEL COMMAND”,
14 with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton,
15 Ohio, strike out “\$14,508,000” and insert in place thereof
16 “\$15,800,000”.

17 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
18 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
19 tion 502 the amounts “\$824,300,000” and “\$1,363,-
20 189,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$826,038,000”
21 and “\$1,364,927,000”, respectively.

22 SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
23 as amended, is amended, under the heading “INSIDE THE
24 UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

1 Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—

2 (1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport,
3 Duluth, Minnesota, strike out "\$1,469,000" and insert
4 in place thereof "\$1,636,000".

5 (2) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Fal-
6 mouth, Massachusetts, strike out "\$11,577,000" and
7 insert in place thereof "\$13,341,000".

8 Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND", with
9 respect to Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, strike out
10 "\$1,339,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,661,000".

11 Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND", with
12 respect to James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas,
13 strike out "\$4,687,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,-
14 301,000".

15 Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND",
16 with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls,
17 Montana, strike out "\$1,586,000" and insert in place thereof
18 "\$1,726,000".

19 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
20 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section
21 402 the amounts "\$811,342,000" and "\$1,447,950,000"
22 and inserting in place thereof "\$814,349,000" and "\$1,450,-
23 957,000", respectively.

1 SEC. 307. (a) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Con-
2 gress, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED
3 STATES" in section 301, as follows:

4 Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—

5 (1) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glas-
6 gow, Montana, strike out "\$2,048,000" and insert in
7 place thereof "\$2,390,000".

8 (2) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base,
9 Kansas City, Missouri, strike out "\$1,100,000" and in-
10 sert in place thereof "\$1,348,000".

11 (3) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot,
12 North Dakota, strike out "\$6,804,000" and insert in
13 place thereof "\$8,507,000".

14 (4) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth,
15 Massachusetts, strike out "\$559,000" and insert in place
16 thereof "\$615,000".

17 Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND",
18 with respect to Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas,
19 strike out "\$899,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,128,-
20 000".

21 Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND", with
22 respect to Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas, strike out
23 "\$460,000" and insert in place thereof "\$637,000".

Under the subheading “STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND”—

(1) with respect to Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana, strike out “\$3,344,000” and insert in place thereof “\$3,633,000”.

(2) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California, strike out “\$7,458,000” and insert in place thereof “\$9,087,000”.

(3) with respect to MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida, strike out “\$936,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,268,000”.

(4) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out “\$2,344,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,947,000”.

(5) with respect to Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri, strike out “\$235,000” and insert in place thereof “\$306,000”.

(b) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts “\$394,076,000” and “\$601,781,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$399,755,000” and “\$607,460,000”, respectively.

SEC. 308. (a) Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended, under the heading “ALERT AND DISPER-

1 SAL OF STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND FORCES” in section 1,
2 as follows:

3 (1) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base,
4 Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out “\$895,000”
5 and insert in place thereof “\$1,892,000”.

6 (2) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot,
7 North Dakota, strike out “\$867,000” and insert in
8 place thereof “\$1,479,000”.

9 (3) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force
10 Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out “\$4,380,000”
11 and insert in place thereof “\$5,479,000”.

12 (4) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha,
13 Nebraska, strike out “\$690,000” and insert in place
14 thereof \$969,000”.

15 (b) Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Congress, is
16 amended by striking out in section 3 the amount “\$549,-
17 670,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$552,657,000”.

18 SEC. 309. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act,
19 as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking
20 out in the first sentence the figure “\$135,425,000” and in-
21 serting in place thereof the figure “\$139,797,000”.

22 TITLE IV

23 SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or
24 develop installations and facilities required for advanced
25 research projects and in connection therewith may acquire,

1 construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or
2 temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
3 preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the
4 total amount of \$50,000,000.

5 TITLE V

6 GENERAL PROVISIONS

7 SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary
8 of each military department may proceed to establish or
9 develop installations and facilities under this Act without
10 regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as
11 amended (31 U. S. C. 529, 40 U. S. C. 259, 267), and
12 sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States
13 Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary im-
14 provements on land includes authority for surveys, admin-
15 istration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to
16 construction. That authority may be exercised before title
17 to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised
18 Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C. 255), and even though
19 the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real
20 estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to
21 acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary
22 use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned
23 land, or otherwise.

24 SEC. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such
25 sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but

1 appropriations, for public works projects authorized by titles
2 I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

3 (1) for title I: Inside the United States,
4 \$111,491,000; outside the United States, \$9,416,000;
5 section 102, \$201,121,000; section 103, \$25,000,000;
6 or a total of \$347,028,000.

7 (2) for title II: Inside the United States,
8 \$194,677,000; outside the United States, \$16,384,000;
9 section 202, \$65,001,000; section 203, \$25,000,000;
10 or a total of \$301,062,000.

11 (3) for title III: Inside the United States,
12 \$525,101,000; outside the United States, \$118,670,000;
13 section 302, \$317,500,000; section 303, \$25,000,000;
14 or a total of \$986,271,000.

15 (4) for title IV: \$50,000,000.

16 SEC. 503. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and
17 III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary con-
18 cerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside
19 the United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside
20 the United States. However, the total cost of all projects
21 in each such title may not be more than the total amount
22 authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

23 SEC. 504. Any outstanding authority heretofore pro-
24 vided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119),
25 the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of

1 August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991), for the provision of family
2 housing shall be available for the construction of family
3 housing at any installations for which appropriated fund
4 family housing is authorized to be constructed under titles
5 I and III of this Act.

6 SEC. 505. Whenever—

7 (1) the President determines that compliance with
8 section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for
9 contracts made under this Act for the establishment or
10 development of military installations and facilities in
11 foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of
12 this Act; and

13 (2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller
14 General have agreed upon alternative methods of ade-
15 quately auditing those contracts; the President may
16 exempt those contracts from the requirements of that
17 section.

18 SEC. 506. Contracts made by the United States under
19 this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a com-
20 petitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national
21 security will not be impaired and the award is consistent
22 with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and sec-
23 tion 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547, 551).
24 The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semi-
25 annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of

1 the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts
2 awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest
3 responsible bidder.

4 SEC. 507. As of July 1, 1959, all authorization for mili-
5 tary public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of
6 a military department in connection with the establishment
7 or development of military installations and facilities, and all
8 authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained
9 in Acts approved before August 4, 1956, and not superseded
10 or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed,
11 except—

12 (1) authorizations for public works and for appro-
13 priations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the
14 titles that contain the general provisions;

15 (2) the authorization for public works projects
16 as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for
17 construction contracts or land acquisition in whole or
18 in part before July 1, 1959, and authorizations for
19 appropriations therefor;

20 (3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for
21 family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is
22 contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952
23 (66 Stat. 606, 622) ;

24 (4) the authorizations for public works and the
25 appropriation of funds that are contained in sections

1 2231-2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended
2 (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886) ;

3 (5) the authorization for the development of the
4 Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$30,-
5 000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the
6 Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609) ;

7 (6) the authorization for development of classified
8 facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in
9 title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951
10 (65 Stat. 336, 343) ;

11 (7) the authorization for public works and for the
12 appropriation of funds that are contained in the Act of
13 April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47) , as amended; and

14 (8) notwithstanding the provision of section 506 of
15 the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 558), the
16 authorization for:

17 (a) jet engine test cells in the amount of \$1,-
18 850,000 at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia,
19 that is contained in title II, section 201 under the
20 heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and sub-
21 heading "AVIATION FACILITIES" of the Act of
22 August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 440, 442) , as amended;

23 (b) ammunition storage facilities in the
24 amount of \$225,000 at the Naval Auxiliary Air
25 Station, El Centro, California; navigational aids in

1 the amount of \$590,000 at the Marine Corps Air
2 Station, El Toro, California; research and develop-
3 ment facilities in the amount of \$1,804,000 at the
4 Naval Air Turbine Test Station, Trenton, New Jer-
5 sey; and navigational aids in the amount of
6 \$400,000 at the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island,
7 Washington: that are contained in title II, section
8 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED
9 STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES"
10 of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 540),
11 as amended;

12 (c) the development of aviation ordnance facili-
13 ties in the amount of \$2,638,000 that is contained
14 in title II, section 202, of the Act of July 27, 1954
15 (68 Stat. 535, 543), as amended.

16 SEC. 508. Section 408 (b) of the Act of June 17, 1950
17 (64 Stat. 236, 245), is hereby repealed.

18 SEC. 509. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955
19 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to
20 read as follows:

21 "SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1958 through and in-
22 cluding 1961, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air
23 Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities
24 at or near military tactical installations for assignment as

1 public quarters to military personnel and their dependents,
2 if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the
3 Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack
4 of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical
5 installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a
6 family or individual unit basis and not more than five thou-
7 sand of such units may be so leased at any one time. Ex-
8 penditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be
9 made out of appropriations available for maintenance and
10 operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such
11 unit.”

12 SEC. 510. Section 406 of the Act of August 3, 1956
13 (70 Stat 991, 1015), is amended to read as follows:

14 “SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of a military department
15 may acquire any interest in land that—

16 “(1) he or his designee determines is needed in the
17 interest of national defense; and

18 “(2) does not cost more than \$25,000 (exclusive of
19 administrative costs and the amounts of any deficiency
20 judgments).

21 This section does not authorize the acquisition, as part of
22 the same project, of two or more contiguous parcels of land
23 that together cost more than \$25,000.”

24 SEC. 511. Section 408 (a) of the Act of August 3,

1 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), is amended by adding the fol-
2 lowing new subsection at the end thereof:

3 “(5) No determination that a project is urgently re-
4 quired shall be necessary for projects, the cost of which is
5 not in excess of \$5,000.”

6 SEC. 512. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act
7 of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), is amended to read
8 as follows:

9 “(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law,
10 and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be
11 contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installa-
12 tions or activities unless the actual number of units involved
13 has been specifically authorized by an annual military con-
14 struction authorization Act except (1) housing units required
15 to be acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404
16 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) housing units
17 leased, utilizing available operation and maintenance appro-
18 priations, for terms of one year, whether renewable or not,
19 or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the pro-
20 visions of section 417 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat.
21 991, 1018); and (3) rental guaranty family housing author-
22 ized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat.
23 606, 622).

1 SEC. 513. (a) Section 2662, title 10, United States
2 Code, is repealed.

3 (b) The analysis of chapter 159, title 10, United
4 States Code, is amended by striking out the following item:

“2662. Real property transactions: agreement with Armed Services Com-
mittees; reports.”

5 (c) Section 43 of the Act of August 10, 1956 (70A
6 Stat. 636), is repealed.

85TH CONGRESS
2d Session

H. R. 12360

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VINSON

MAY 6, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

Conferees were appointed on H. R. 11574, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1959. Senate conferees were appointed June 9. p. 10135

Received from the Treasury a report of the Bureau of Accounts covering restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and funds accounts under the control of that Department. p. 10176

22. EXPORT CONTROL. Passed without amendment S. 3093, to extend the Export Control Act for two years until June 30, 1960. This bill will now be sent to the President. A similar bill, H. R. 10127, was laid on the table. pp. 10146-151
23. BUILDING SPACE. Passed with amendments S. 2533, to authorize GSA to lease space for Federal agencies for periods not exceeding ten years. pp. 10140-141
24. FLOOD CONTROL. Rep. Beamer discussed flood damage in Ind., and urged enactment of a rivers and harbors and flood control bill. p. 10138

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

25. WATER RESOURCES. Extension of remarks of Sen. Johnson inserting an article pointing up the need for water conservation. p. A5439
Sen. Proxmire inserted resolutions adopted by the Isaak Walton League expressing the League's stand on issues relating to conservation and development of our natural resources. pp. A5445-7
Rep. Brooks inserted the remarks of Maj. Gen. Itschner, U. S. Army Engineers, telling of the development of water projects by the Soviets. pp. A5493-4
Rep. Brooks inserted Asst. Secretary of the Interior Aandahl's recent address, "Water: Our Greatest Natural Resource." pp. A5497-8
26. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Talmadge inserted several editorials in favor of his proposed farm program. pp. A5443-4
Extension of remarks of Rep. Thomson commending a program sponsored by the U. S. Junior Chamber of Commerce which is designed to seek out and honor 4 young men who have made outstanding contributions in the field of agriculture and conservation. p. A5457
27. WILDLIFE. Extension of remarks of Sen. Neuberger inserting an article, "Man's Upset of Nature Caused Oregon's Rodent Problem--Killing Predators Caused Mice, Porcupine Increase." pp. A5444-5
28. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Extension of remarks of Rep. Dixon inserting an article, "Contract Milking," describing the successful efforts of small dairy farmers in Utah to set up cooperative milking parlors. pp. A5450-2
29. BUDGET BUREAU. Extension of remarks of Rep. Robison commending the Bureau of the Budget, stating that it serves a "most necessary and useful purpose," and inserting an address by the present Director, Maurice H. Stans. pp. A5458-9
30. COUNTRY LIFE. Extension of remarks of Sen. Morton inserting two editorials endorsing the proposed establishment of a Commission on Country Life. pp. A5464-5
31. FOREIGN TRADE. Speech in the House by Rep. Robison during debate on the trade agreements extension bill. pp. A5467-8
32. ECONOMIC SITUATION. Rep. Bolling inserted a letter to the President from the Federal Statistics Users' Conference and stated "the detailed recommendations which accompanied it point up some very serious gaps in our economic

June 16, 1958

12. PAY RAISE. Received the conference report on S. 734, the pay raise bill for classified employees. The report states that "The committee of conference agreed to reduction in the numbers of additional positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 and additional positions authorized under Public Law 313, 80th Congress, as provided by Senate amendment No. 5, in recognition of the hearings on the need for increase in the numbers of such positions currently being held by the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House. The committee of conference further agrees that the need exists for full and complete hearings on this subject to ascertain the actual requirements of the departments and agencies for such positions and to provide the departments and agencies with the opportunity to justify their specific requests, and that in the future requests for additional such positions should be made and justified by the departments concerned." pp. 10135-137, 10176
Rep. McCormack stated that this bill will be considered today, June 17.
p. 10137
13. GRAIN STANDARDS. Passed as reported S. 2007, to amend the Grain Standards Act to permit the collection of charges to reimburse the Department for overtime, travel, and certain other costs in connection with handling appeal inspections.
pp. 10143-144
14. RECLAMATION. Passed without amendment H. R. 8645, to amend the Reclamation Project Act regarding the repayment of contracts on reclamation projects.
p. 10143
15. VIRGIN ISLANDS. Passed, under suspension of the rules, H. R. 12226, to extend until June 30, 1969, the charter of the Virgin Islands Corporation, including new authority to operate salt water distillation facilities and continuation of authority for sugar production.
16. HOUSING. Rep. Sikes discussed his bill, H. R. 12939, to allow the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages on homes, outside the urban areas, erected before application was made for such a mortgage. pp. 10174-5
17. VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE. Received from the State Department a letter on two recommendations adopted at the International Labor Conference in 1956, including a recommendation concerning vocational training in agriculture.
p. 10176
18. FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendment H. R. 3, to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws (H. Rept. 1878). p. 10176
19. INFORMATION. The Government Operations Committee submitted their 27th report on availability of information from Federal departments and agencies (H. Rept. 1884). p. 10176
20. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. The Armed Services Committee agreed to report a clean bill in lieu of H. R. 12360, the military construction bill, and announced that a rollcall vote would be taken on the reporting of the clean bill
June 18. p. D548
21. APPROPRIATIONS. Received the conference report on H. R. 12540, the Commerce Department and related agencies appropriation bill for 1959 (H. Rept. 1881). The conferees agreed to shift \$1,000,000 from the 1958 authorization to the 1959 authorization under "Forest Highways," and to earmark \$48,000 of Weather Bureau funds for agricultural weather forecasting in the Mississippi Delta.
pp. 10133-135, 10176

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 13015

H. R. 13015

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 18, 1958

Mr. VINSON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and
for other purposes.

1 · *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I

4 SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish
5 or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring,
6 constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing perma-
7 nent or temporary public works, including site preparation,
8 appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following
9 projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,697,000.

Detroit Arsenal, Michigan: Administrative facilities, \$5,666,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$8,529,000.

Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois: Operational and training facilities, \$570,000.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, research, development and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$7,931,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$4,630,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Army Chemical Center, Maryland: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Troop housing, \$1,795,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, administrative fa-

1 cilities, troop housing, operational and training facilities, and
2 utilities, \$9,098,000.

3 (Corps of Engineers)

4 Army Map Service, Maryland: Operational and train-
5 ing facilities, \$1,913,000.

6 (Transportation Corps)

7 Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational and training facili-
8 ties, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities,
9 \$3,634,000.

10 (Medical Corps)

11 Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Troop housing,
12 \$862,000.

13 FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

14 (First Army Area)

15 Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational and training
16 facilities, \$171,000.

17 Fort Dix, New Jersey: Troop housing and utilities,
18 \$3,749,000.

19 (Second Army Area)

20 Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: Hospital facilities,
21 family housing, and real estate, \$2,274,000.

22 Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational and training facili-
23 ties, and utilities, \$516,000.

24 Fort Meade, Maryland: Operational and training facili-
25 ties, \$498,000.

1 Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Supply facilities, \$43,000.

2 (Third Army Area)

3 Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational and training facili-
4 ties, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and family hous-
5 ing, \$3,454,000.

6 Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and training
7 facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$762,000.

8 Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational and training fa-
9 cilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and admin-
10 istrative facilities, \$847,000.

11 Fort McClellan, Alabama: Operational and training

12 Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facili-
13 ties, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities,
14 \$2,406,000.

15 (Fourth Army Area)

16 Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities,
17 maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$13,734,-
18 000.

19 Fort Hood, Texas: Operational and training facilities,
20 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
21 ties, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,258,000.

1 Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities,
2 maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities,
3 \$3,227,000.

4 (Fifth Army Area)

5 Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Troop housing, and
6 family housing, \$783,000.

7 Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Operational and training
8 facilities, and troop housing, \$1,076,000.

9 Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational and training facilities,
10 and utilities, \$1,084,000.

11 (Sixth Army Area)

12 Baywood Park, California: Real estate, \$144,000.

13 Camp Desert Rock, Nevada: Maintenance facilities,
14 troop housing, and utilities, \$2,892,000.

15 Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational and training
16 facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,085,000.

17 Fort Ord, California: Operational and training facilities,
18 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-
19 munity facilities, and utilities, \$4,733,000.

20 Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Operational and training
21 facilities, \$173,000.

1 (Military Academy)

2 United States Military Academy, West Point, New
3 York: Troop housing, medical facilities, and community
4 facilities, \$5,844,000.

5 (Armed Forces Special Weapons)

6 Various locations: Maintenance facilities, community
7 facilities, and utilities, \$273,000.

8 (Tactical Installations Support Facilities)

9 Various locations: Maintenance facilities, \$6,311,000.

10 OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

11 (Alaskan Area)

12 Fairbanks Permafrost Research Area: Real estate,
13 \$7,000.

14 (Pacific Command Area)

15 Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: Operational and training fa-
16 cilities, \$240,000.

17 Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Troop housing, \$593,000.

18 Fort Shafter, Hawaii: Supply facilities, maintenance
19 facilities, family housing, and community facilities, \$2,-
20 925,000.

21 Korea: Operational and training facilities, supply facili-
22 ties, and utilities, \$904,000.

(United States Army, Europe)

France: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,063,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$201,121,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in

1 the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Sec-
2 retary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Com-
3 mittees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of
4 Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision
5 to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work
6 undertaken under this section, including those real estate
7 actions pertaining thereto.

8 SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of
9 section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119,
10 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized
11 to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing
12 for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations
13 by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the pro-
14 visions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assist-
15 ance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other com-
16 modity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

17 Various locations, France, 298 units.

18 Vicenza, Italy, 371 units.

19 Army Security Agency, location 13, 91 units.

20 Gateway Communications Station, 174 units.

21 (b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of
22 the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as
23 amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to con-
24 struct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at
25 the following locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

- 1
- 2 Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, 316 units.
- 3 Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York, 120 units.
- 4 White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, 200 units.
- 5 Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, 130 units.
- 6 Fort Lee, Virginia, 435 units.
- 7 Natick R&E, Massachusetts, 35 units.
- 8 Fort Belvoir, Virginia, 618 units.
- 9 Two Rock Ranch Station, California, 25 units.
- 10 Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 50 units.
- 11 Beaumont Army Hospital, Texas, 125 units.
- 12 Fort Totten, New York, 130 units.
- 13 Fort Campbell, Kentucky, 837 units.
- 14 Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois, 65 units.
- 15 Fort Rucker, Alabama, 400 units.
- 16 Fort Stewart, Georgia, 73 units.
- 17 Fort Bliss, Texas, 410 units.
- 18 Fort Hood, Texas, 500 units.
- 19 Fort Sill, Oklahoma, 349 units.
- 20 Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 700 units.
- 21 Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, 200 units.
- 22 Fort Sheridan, Illinois, 50 units.
- 23 Forts Baker and Barry, California, 98 units.
- 24 Oakland Army Terminal, California, 88 units.

1 Fort Lewis, Washington, 856 units.

2 Branch United States Disciplinary Barracks, California,
3 160 units.

4 United States Military Academy, New York, 156 units.

5 Bossier Base, Louisiana, 200 units.

6 Fort Eustis, Virginia, 223 units.

7 Medina Base, Texas, 125 units.

8 Sandia Base, New Mexico, 213 units.

9 Army Air Defense Command Stations, 466 units.

10 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

11 Canal Zone, 330 units.

12 Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, 385 units.

13 Fort Shafter, Hawaii, 481 units: *Provided, however,*
14 That no family housing units shall be constructed on Fort
15 DeRussy.

16 (c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404
17 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as
18 amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to acquire
19 family housing at the following location:

20 Aberdeen Proving Ground, Aberdeen, Maryland, 796
21 units.

22 SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress,
23 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
24 UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

1 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICE FACILI-
2 TIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Pueblo Ordnance
3 Depot, Colorado, strike out "\$563,000" and insert in place
4 thereof "\$600,000".

5 (b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as
6 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
7 tion 502 the amounts "\$44,407,000" and "\$134,075,000"
8 and inserting in place thereof "\$44,444,000" and "\$134,-
9 112,000", respectively.

10 SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
11 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
12 UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

13 (1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES
14 FACILITIES (Transportation Corps)", with respect to Point-
15 Aux-Pins Ammunition Terminal, Alabama-Mississippi, strike
16 out "Point-Aux-Pins Area Ammunition Terminal, Alabama-
17 Mississippi: Ammunition loading terminal, including acqui-
18 sition of land, \$26,951,000" and insert in place thereof
19 "Point-Aux-Pins Area Ammunition Storage Depot and Ter-
20 minal, Alabama-Mississippi: Ammunition storage depot and
21 ammunition loading terminal, including acquisition of land,
22 \$44,168,000".

23 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
24 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section

1 502 the amounts “\$131,906,000” and “\$238,870,000” and
2 inserting in place thereof “\$149,123,000” and “\$256,087,-
3 000” respectively.

4 SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-
5 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTI-
6 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

7 (1) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-
8 CILITIES (Ordnance Corps)”, with respect to Redstone
9 Arsenal, Alabama, strike out “\$2,865,000” and insert in
10 place thereof “\$4,180,000”.

11 (2) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-
12 CILITIES (Signal Corps)” with respect to Fort Monmouth,
13 New Jersey, strike out “\$615,000” and insert in place
14 thereof “\$731,000”; and with respect to Vint Hill Farms
15 Station, Virginia, strike out “\$695,000” and insert in place
16 thereof “\$1,022,000”.

17 (3) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-
18 CILITIES (Corps of Engineers)”, with respect to Granite
19 City Engineer Depot, Illinois, strike out “\$1,822,000” and
20 insert in place thereof “\$2,815,000”.

21 (4) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-
22 CILITIES (Medical Corps)”, with respect to Walter Reed
23 Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, strike out “\$4,-
24 472,000” and insert in place thereof “\$6,714,000”.

25 (5) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

1 (Second Army Area)", with respect to Fort George G.
2 Meade, Maryland, strike out "\$923,000" and insert in place
3 thereof "\$1,264,000".

4 (6) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
5 (Fourth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas,
6 strike out "\$4,645,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,-
7 965,000"; and with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike
8 out "\$3,053,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,454,000".

9 (7) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
10 (Sixth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Ord, California,
11 strike out "\$1,407,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,-
12 742,000".

13 (8) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
14 (Military Academy)", with respect to the United States
15 Military Academy, New York, strike out "\$756,000" and
16 insert in place thereof "\$1,171,000".

17 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
18 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
19 502 the amounts "\$237,320,000" and "\$546,387,000" and
20 inserting in place thereof "\$244,125,000" and "\$553,192,-
21 000", respectively.

22 SEC. 108. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
23 as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE
24 UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

25 (1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES

1 FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to White
2 Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico, strike out "\$693,000"
3 and insert in place thereof "\$735,000".

4 (2) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES
5 FACILITIES (Chemical Corps)", with respect to Camp
6 Detrick, Maryland, strike out "\$913,000" and insert in place
7 thereof "\$1,074,000"; and with respect to Dugway Proving
8 Ground, Utah, strike out "\$867,000" and insert in place
9 thereof "\$1,044,000".

10 (3) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES
11 FACILITIES (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Hua-
12 chuca, Arizona, strike out "\$6,856,000" and insert in place
13 thereof "\$7,576,000".

14 (4) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES
15 FACILITIES (Corps of Engineers)", with respect to Fort
16 Belvoir, Virginia, strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place
17 thereof "\$940,000".

18 (5) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES
19 FACILITIES (Transportation Corps)", with respect to Fort
20 Eustis, Virginia, strike out "\$1,231,000" and insert in place
21 thereof "\$1,436,000".

22 (6) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
23 (First Army Area)", with respect to Fort Dix, New Jersey,
24 strike out "\$54,000" and insert in place thereof "\$68,000".

1 (7) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
2 (Second Army Area)", with respect to Fort George G.
3 Meade, Maryland, strike out "\$5,885,000" and insert in
4 place thereof "\$7,695,000".

5 (8) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
6 (Third Army Area)", with respect to Fort Benning,
7 Georgia, strike out "\$422,000" and insert in place thereof
8 "\$616,000"; and with respect to Fort McClellan, Alabama,
9 strike out "\$397,000" and insert in place thereof
10 "\$527,000".

11 (9) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
12 (Fourth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Hood, Texas,
13 strike out "\$2,457,000" and insert in place thereof
14 "\$2,846,000".

15 (10) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILI-
16 TIES (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Riley,
17 Kansas, strike out "\$1,519,000" and insert in place thereof
18 "\$1,892,000".

19 (11) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILI-
20 TIES (Sixth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Lewis,
21 Washington, strike out "\$3,022,000" and insert in place
22 thereof "\$3,596,000"; and with respect to Fort Ord, Cali-
23 fornia, strike out "\$223,000" and insert in place thereof
24 "\$319,000".

1 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
2 amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE
3 UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

4 Under the subheading "(Alaskan Area)", with re-
5 spect to Wildwood Station (Kenai), strike out "\$352,000"
6 and insert in place thereof "\$516,000".

7 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
8 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
9 tion 402 the amounts "\$95,010,000", "\$35,763,000", and
10 "\$334,104,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$100,-
11 343,000", "\$35,927,000", and "\$339,601,000", respec-
12 tively.

13 SEC. 109. (a) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Con-
14 gress, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED
15 STATES" in section 101 as follows:

16 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACIL-
17 ITIES (Corps of Engineers)" with respect to Cold Regions
18 Laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire, strike out "\$2,496,-
19 000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,787,000".

20 (b) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is
21 amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the
22 amounts "\$115,624,000" and "\$293,103,000" and insert-
23 ing in place thereof "\$116,915,000" and "\$294,394,000".

24 SEC. 110. The Secretary of the Army is authorized and
25 directed to enter into a contract or contracts for the sale of

1 the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Texas, and convey a clear
2 title by quitclaim deed all right, title, and interest of the
3 United States in and to said depot, to any legal person or
4 group, except Government agencies or departments, upon
5 such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be
6 in the public interest. The Secretary of the Army is directed
7 to act as follows:

8 (1) The depot shall be moved to, and integrated
9 with, the ammunition outloading terminal previously
10 authorized for construction at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala-
11 bama, and, notwithstanding any other provisions of this
12 or any other Act, the authority contained in the Act of
13 July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 536), for the acquisition of
14 land and initiation of construction for the Point-Aux-
15 Pins facility shall continue in effect until specifically
16 superseded, modified, or repealed.

17 (2) The sale of the San Jacinto Depot property
18 shall be offered by the Chief of Engineers, United States
19 Army, on behalf of and under the supervision of the
20 Secretary of the Army within eighteen months from the
21 date of this Act. No part of the land herein shall be
22 sold, transferred, or occupied, by virtue of this transac-
23 tion, by any Government agency or department.

24 (3) A contract or contracts for the sale of the San

1 Jacinto Depot shall be consummated as expeditiously as
2 possible thereafter and on such terms as are determined
3 by the Secretary of the Army to be in the best interest of
4 the United States: *Provided*, That if the property is to
5 be conveyed under any terms by which the purchase
6 price is not paid in full simultaneously with the signing
7 of the contract, title shall remain in the United States
8 until full payment is made but there shall be no penalty
9 or charges made for deferred payment.

10 (4) All proceeds from the sale shall be available
11 to administer the provisions of this section and to pay
12 any and all expenses, including land acquisition, in con-
13 nection with the relocation, exchange, or sale of the
14 San Jacinto Depot or the establishment of a fully in-
15 tegrated depot at Point-Aux-Pins, Alabama, or all pro-
16 ceeds deposited into the Treasury of the United States
17 for obligation by the Army.

18 (5) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
19 such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carry-
20 ing out the provisions of this section, and the monetary
21 limitation imposed by section 502 hereof shall not be
22 inclusive of any funds required for or in connection with
23 the San Jacinto Depot relocation.

24 Notwithstanding any provision of this section to the
25 contrary to the United States may retain possession of the

1 San Jacinto Depot or any part thereof until such time as
2 facilities are substantially completed and available for use
3 at Point-Aux-Pins, Alabama.

4 SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or
5 develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, con-
6 structing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent
7 or temporary public works, including site preparation,
8 appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following
9 projects:

10 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

11 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

12 Naval Facility, Cape May, New Jersey: Operational
13 and training facilities, \$141,000.

14 Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Drydock,
15 \$10,000,000.

16 Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Operational
17 and training facilities, \$6,000,000: *Provided, however, That*
18 no more than \$500,000 of this sum shall be utilized for
19 protective works until the Secretary of the Navy determines
20 in his judgment that sufficient action has been taken or
21 arrangements made to arrest further subsidence of the ship-
22 yard.

23 Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut:
24 Operational and training facilities, \$2,247,000.

1 Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California: Operational
2 and training facilities, \$766,000.

3 FLEET BASE FACILITIES

4 Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing,
5 and community facilities, \$1,709,000.

6 Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational and train-
7 ing facilities, \$2,546,000.

8 AVIATION FACILITIES

9 (Naval Air Training Stations)

10 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Troop
11 housing, \$1,041,000.

12 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi:
13 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
14 supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community
15 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
16 \$14,940,000.

17 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida:
18 Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground im-
19 provements, and real estate, \$4,679,000.

20 (Fleet Support Air Stations)

21 Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational and
22 training facilities, \$114,000.

23 Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Maintenance
24 facilities, \$1,252,000.

1 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Cali-
2 fornia: Operational and training facilities, \$47,000.

3 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, \$80,000.

5 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Fentress, Virginia:
6 Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

7 Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina:
8 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
9 medical facilities, troop housing, administrative facilities, and
10 utilities and ground improvements, \$11,215,000.

11 Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational
12 and training facilities, \$74,000.

13 Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and
14 training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, admin-
15 istrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground
16 improvements, \$15,823,000.

17 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, community fa-
19 cilities, utilities, and real estate, \$9,892,000.

20 Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California:
21 Operational facilities, and real estate, \$7,000,000.

22 Naval Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field, Florida:
23 Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

1 (Marine Corps Air Stations)

2 Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South
3 Carolina: Operational and training facilities and real estate,
4 \$4,352,000.

5 Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Caro-
6 lina: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,
7 \$1,067,000.

8 Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina:
9 Operational and training facilities, \$1,003,000.

10 Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California:
11 Operational and training facilities, \$2,158,000.

12 (Special Purpose Air Stations)

13 Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force
14 Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training
15 facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administra-
16 tive facilities, troop housing, utilities, and operational and
17 training facilities at the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River,
18 Maryland, \$17,666,000.

19 Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California:
20 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
21 research, development and test facilities, supply facilities,
22 and troop housing (including operational and training facili-
23 ties and troop housing on San Nicolas Island; and mainte-
24 nance facilities, research, development and test facilities,

1 supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground
2 improvements at Camp Cooke), \$13,841,000.

3 SUPPLY FACILITIES

4 Naval Supply Depot, Newport, Rhode Island: Utilities,
5 \$2,210,000.

6 Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Administrative
7 facilities, \$128,000.

8 Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California: Administra-
9 tive facilities, \$146,000.

10 MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

11 Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California:
12 Operational and training facilities, \$280,000.

13 Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Caro-
14 lina: Utilities, \$462,000.

15 Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Opera-
16 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop
17 housing, and utilities, \$5,138,000.

18 Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Operational
19 and training facilities, \$168,000.

20 Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California:
21 Utilities, \$206,000.

22 Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California:
23 Maintenance facilities, \$241,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

2 Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Main-
3 tenance facilities, \$86,000.

4 Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California:
5 Supply facilities, \$129,000.

6 Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord, California: Main-
7 tenance facilities, \$2,517,000.

8 Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, California: Re-
9 search, development, and test facilities, \$510,000.

10 Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Virginia: Research,
11 development, and test facilities, \$44,000.

12 Naval Ammunition Depot, Hingham, Massachusetts:
13 Maintenance facilities, \$694,000.

14 Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland:
15 Research, development, and test facilities, \$601,000.

16 SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

17 Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Troop housing,
18 \$14,200,000.

19 Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Vir-
20 ginia: Operational and training facilities, \$1,184,000.

21 Naval Receiving Station, District of Columbia: Opera-
22 tional facilities, \$650,000.

23 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Opera-
24 tional and training facilities, \$1,368,000.

1 Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island: Opera-
2 tional and training facilities, \$273,000.

3 Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, \$4,643,000.

5 Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Opera-
6 tional and training facilities, \$4,199,000.

7 MEDICAL FACILITIES

8 National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland:
9 Hospital and medical facilities, \$8,503,000.

10 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

11 Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Opera-
12 tional and training facilities, and utilities and ground im-
13 provements, \$38,654,000.

14 OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

15 Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Re-
16 search, development, and test facilities, \$192,000.

17 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

18 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

19 Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory
20 of Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, \$159,000.

21 AVIATION FACILITIES

22 Naval Air Station, Agana, Mariana Islands: Opera-
23 tional and training facilities, and real estate, \$4,414,000.

1 Naval Station, Bermuda, British West Indies: Opera-
2 tional and training facilities, \$683,000.

3 Naval Air Station, Ford Island, Territory of Hawaii:
4 Operational and training facilities, \$1,271,000.

5 Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Supply facilities,
6 \$165,000.

7 Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Opera-
8 tional and training facilities, \$3,824,000.

9 SUPPLY FACILITIES

10 Naval Supply Depot, Guam, Mariana Islands: Supply
11 facilities, \$3,060,000.

12 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

13 Naval Communication Unit Number Three, Asmara,
14 Eritrea: Operational and training facilities, \$1,180,000.

15 Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland:
16 Operational and training facilities, \$219,000.

17 Naval Radio Facility, Port Lyautey, Morocco: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, \$519,000.

19 YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

20 Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities,
21 \$890,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including

1 land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and
2 equipment in the total amount of \$75,301,000.

3 SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or
4 develop naval installations and facilities by proceeding with
5 construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions,
6 new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research
7 and development requirements, or improved production
8 schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that de-
9 ferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military
10 construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with
11 interests of national security, and in connection therewith to
12 acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent
13 or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
14 preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the
15 total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary
16 of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on
17 Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives
18 immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of
19 the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under
20 this section, including those real estate actions pertaining
21 thereto.

22 SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of
23 section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119,
24 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized
25 to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing

1 for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities
2 at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies
3 acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade
4 Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454)
5 or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity
6 Credit Corporation:

7 Naval Magazine, Cartagena, Spain, 46 units, and com-
8 munity facilities.

9 Naval Magazine, El Ferrol, Spain, 45 units, and com-
10 munity facilities.

11 Naval Air Station, Port Lyautey, Morocco, 330 units.

12 Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Italy, 122 units, and
13 community facilities.

14 (b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the
15 Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended,
16 the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct fami-
17 ly housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following
18 locations:

19 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

20 Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, 277 units.

21 Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina,
22 800 units.

23 Naval Facility, Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, 27 units.

24 Naval Facility, Centerville, California, 24 units.

- 1 Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina,
- 2 849 units.
- 3 Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oregon, 24 units.
- 4 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, 425 units.
- 5 Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 800 units.
- 6 Naval Facility, Nantucket, Massachusetts, 19 units.
- 7 Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500
- 8 units.
- 9 Naval Facility, Pacific Beach, Washington, 30 units.
- 10 Naval Facility, Point Sur, California, 24 units.
- 11 Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, 550
- 12 units.
- 13 Naval Ordnance Missile Test Facility, White Sands
- 14 Proving Grounds, New Mexico, 51 units.

15 OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES

- 16 Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of
- 17 Hawaii, 1,140 units.
- 18 Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, Headquarters, Camp H. M.
- 19 Smith, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 168 units.
- 20 Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands, 220 units.
- 21 Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Terri-
- 22 tory of Hawaii, 650 units.
- 23 Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii.
- 24 80 units.

1 Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii,
2 650 units.

3 (c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404
4 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as
5 amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to acquire
6 family housing at the following locations:

7 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, 96
8 units.

9 Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Maryland, 385
10 units.

11 Naval Station, Green Cove Springs, Florida, 392 units.

12 SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Con-
13 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTI-
14 NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

15 Under the subheading "MEDICAL FACILITIES", with re-
16 spect to the Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Virginia Area, strike
17 out "\$12,815,000" and insert in place thereof "\$13,979,-
18 000".

19 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
20 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section
21 402 the amounts "\$139,143,000" and "\$266,927,000", and
22 inserting respectively in place thereof "\$140,307,000", and
23 "\$268,091,000".

24 SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
25 as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202,

1 “\$70,656,000”, and inserting in place thereof “\$72,785,-
2 000”.

3 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
4 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section
5 502 the amounts “\$70,656,000”, and “\$210,704,000” and
6 inserting respectively in place thereof “\$72,785,000”, and
7 “\$212,833,000”.

8 SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
9 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
10 UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:

11 (1) Under the subheading “MARINE CORPS FACIL-
12 ITIES”, with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pen-
13 dleton, California, strike out “\$648,000” and insert in place
14 thereof “\$778,000”.

15 (2) Under the subheading “ORDNANCE FACILITIES”,
16 with respect to the Naval Underwater Ordnance Station,
17 Newport, Rhode Island, strike out “\$370,000” and insert
18 in place thereof “\$411,000”.

19 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
20 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CONTI-
21 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 201, as follows:

22 Under subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES”, with re-
23 spect to the Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Is-
24 lands, by striking out “\$6,525,000” and inserting in place
25 thereof “\$9,063,000” and with respect to the Naval Station,

1 Argentina, Newfoundland, by striking out “\$8,589,800” and
2 inserting in place thereof “\$9,089,800”.

3 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
4 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
5 tion 502 the amounts “\$308,463,600”, “\$108,365,300”, and
6 \$575,592,300” and inserting respectively in place thereof
7 “\$308,634,600”, “\$111,403,300”, and “\$578,801,300”.

8 SEC. 208. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Con-
9 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading “INSIDE
10 THE UNITED STATES” in section 201, as follows:

11 (1) Under the subheading “FLEET BASE FACILITIES”,
12 with respect to the Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island,
13 strike out “\$11,672,000” and insert in place thereof
14 “\$14,601,000”.

15 (2) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
16 (Naval Air Training Stations)”, with respect to the Naval
17 Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas, strike out
18 “\$2,247,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,569,000”;
19 and with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Merid-
20 ian, Mississippi, strike out “\$8,231,000” and insert in place
21 thereof “\$9,141,000”.

22 (3) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
23 (Marine Corps Air Stations)”, with respect to the Marine
24 Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, strike out
25 “\$170,000” and insert in place thereof “\$273,000”.

1 (4) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
 2 TIES", with respect to the Fleet Air Defense Training
 3 Center, Dam Neck, Virginia, strike out "\$237,000" and
 4 insert in place thereof "\$300,000", and with respect to the
 5 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, strike out
 6 "\$8,413,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,613,000".

7 (5) Under the subheading "MEDICAL FACILITIES",
 8 with respect to the Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Illinois,
 9 strike out "\$12,730,000" and insert in place thereof
 10 "\$14,754,000".

11 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 12 amended, is amended by striking out in section 203
 13 "\$85,939,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$86,711,000".

14 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 15 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
 16 tion 402 the amounts "\$303,453,000", "\$85,939,000", and
 17 "\$451,393,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof
 18 "\$312,004,000", "\$86,711,000", and "\$460,716,000".

19 SEC. 209. Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress,
 20 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED
 21 STATES" in section 201 as follows:

22 Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special
 23 Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air
 24 Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, insert before
 25 "\$7,669,000" the words "and land acquisition,".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$2,649,000.

Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Troop housing, \$990,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$10,659,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,176,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,

1 supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities,
2 troop housing, and utilities, \$10,673,000.

3 Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Community
4 facilities, and utilities, \$229,000.

5 Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan:
6 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
7 supply facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, \$9,948,000.

8 McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington:
9 Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$935,000.

10 Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Main-
11 tenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities,
12 troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,721,000.

13 Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Opera-
14 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop
15 housing, and utilities, \$3,689,000.

16 Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Medical
17 facilities, \$122,000.

18 Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri:
19 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
20 supply facilities, administrative facilities, and real estate,
21 \$2,799,000.

22 Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan:
23 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and
24 utilities and ground improvements, \$3,579,000.

1 Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach,
2 New York: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

3 Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Troop housing, and
4 ground improvements, \$795,000.

5 Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Opera-
6 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and
7 utilities, \$3,992,000.

8 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Opera-
9 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
10 facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, and utilities,
11 \$8,696,000.

12 AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

13 Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Mainte-
14 nance facilities, and supply facilities, \$975,000.

15 Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational
16 and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate,
17 \$1,177,000.

18 Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and
19 training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing,
20 \$1,746,000.

21 Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Utilities,
22 \$157,000.

23 Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania:
24 Supply facilities, \$94,000.

25 McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California:

1 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
2 supply facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing,
3 \$1,560,000.

4 Memphis General Depot, Memphis, Tennessee: Admin-
5 istrative facilities, \$1,464,000.

6 Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California:
7 Supply facilities, \$658,000.

8 Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania:
9 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
10 medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing,
11 community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$6,169,000.

12 Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational
13 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
14 and utilities, \$4,362,000.

15 Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma:
16 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
17 troop housing, and community facilities, \$5,196,000.

18 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Oper-
19 ational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, re-
20 search, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and
21 medical facilities, \$11,037,000.

22 AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

23 Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research,
24 development, and test facilities, and utilities, \$981,000.

25 Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational

1 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, de-
2 velopment, and test facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and
3 real estate, \$10,109,000.

4 Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico:
5 Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utili-
6 ties, and real estate, \$1,650,000.

7 Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:
8 Supply facilities, and utilities, \$481,000.

9 Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts:
10 Maintenance facilities, \$165,000.

11 Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational
12 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing,
13 and community facilities, \$2,884,000.

14 SCHOOL OF AVIATION MEDICINE

15 School of Aviation Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base,
16 San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, re-
17 search, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, hos-
18 pital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop
19 housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improve-
20 ments, \$12,000,000.

21 AIR TRAINING COMMAND

22 Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational
23 and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities,
24 \$979,000.

25 Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational

1 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
2 ties, utilities, and real estate, \$1,584,000.

3 Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Troop housing,
4 \$640,000.

5 Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Troop housing,
6 \$400,000.

7 Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi:
8 Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$208,000.

9 James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Troop
10 housing, \$750,000.

11 Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado, or alternate
12 location: Operational and training facilities, administrative
13 facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities,
14 \$5,000,000.

15 Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance
16 facilities, and utilities, \$441,000.

17 Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational
18 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
19 \$1,213,000.

20 McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational
21 and training facilities, \$2,119,000.

22 Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Maintenance
23 facilities, \$358,000.

24 Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance
25 facilities, \$319,000.

1 Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Oper-
2 ational and training facilities, and utilities, \$245,000.

3 Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Oper-
4 ational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop
5 housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

6 Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Supply facilities,
7 administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$571,000.

8 Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational
9 and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,770,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$3,081,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,361,000.

16 CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

17 Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Troop
18 housing, \$1,805,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio:
Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
supply facilities, and administrative facilities, troop housing,
community facilities, and utilities, \$11,589,000.

23 Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Utilities,
24 \$172,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland:

Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$18,-
937,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina:

Maintenance facilities, \$78,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational

and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities,
\$2,874,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey:

Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
troop housing, and utilities, \$3,901,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Troop hous-

ing, \$423,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational

and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real
estate, \$4,051,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Op-

erational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities,
\$4,280,000.

1 Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Opera-
2 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
3 facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, commu-
4 nity facilities, and utilities, \$7,868,000.

5 Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational
6 and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and
7 utilities, \$5,080,000.

8 Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas:
9 Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,654,000.

10 Brunswick Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Op-
11 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
12 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community
13 facilities, and utilities, \$11,417,000.

14 Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational
15 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing,
16 and utilities, \$7,996,000.

17 Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$2,-
19 257,000.

20 Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Operational
21 and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities,
22 utilities, and real estate, \$4,578,000.

23 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma:
24 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,

1 supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,-
2 734,000.

3 Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Oper-
4 ational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
5 \$1,939,000.

6 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona:
7 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
8 supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,174,000.

9 Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and
10 training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
11 troop housing, and utilities, \$2,404,000.

12 Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational
13 and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,346,000.

14 Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota:
15 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
16 community facilities, and utilities, \$3,241,000.

17 Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington:
18 Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$4,094,000.

19 Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational
20 and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,
21 and utilities, \$2,703,000.

22 Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Opera-
23 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and
24 ground improvements, \$1,489,000.

1 Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational
2 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
3 \$4,493,000.

4 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana:
5 Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,
6 \$3,401,000.

7 Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington:
8 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
9 supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,795,000.

10 Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational
11 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community
12 facilities, \$897,000.

13 Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Operational
14 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
15 ties, and utilities, \$4,250,000.

16 Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas:
17 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utili-
18 ties, \$3,463,000.

19 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Opera-
20 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate,
21 \$11,716,000.

22 Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational
23 and training facilities, and utilities, \$3,774,000.

24 MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational

1 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
2 \$3,577,000.

3 Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Op-
4 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
5 facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,832,000.

6 March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Opera-
7 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and
8 real estate, \$3,344,000.

9 McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational
10 and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real
11 estate, \$5,137,000.

12 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home,
13 Idaho: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities,
14 and community facilities, \$1,039,000.

15 Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational
16 and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate,
17 \$3,265,000.

18 Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire:
19 Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,
20 \$940,000.

21 Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York:
22 Supply facilities, and utilities, \$208,000.

23 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin:
24 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,

1 supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and com-
2 munity facilities, \$15,552,000.

3 Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational
4 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,-
5 352,000.

6 Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Opera-
7 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
8 \$2,997,000.

9 Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Opera-
10 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, community
11 facilities, and utilities, \$8,431,000.

12 Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachu-
13 setts: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,345,000.

14 Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Op-
15 erational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities,
16 and real estate, \$5,185,000.

17 TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

18 George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Main-
19 tenance facilities, \$536,000.

20 Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Mainte-
21 nance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,371,000.

22 Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South
23 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance fa-
24 cilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,650,000.

1 Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Troop
2 housing, \$591,000.

3 Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North
4 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities,
5 troop housing, and utilities, \$4,858,000.

6 Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Opera-
7 tional and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,-
8 339,000.

9 Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational
10 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
11 ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real
12 estate, \$5,474,000.

13 SPECIAL FACILITIES

14 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
15 \$563,000.

16 AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

17 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
18 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities,
19 administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, com-
20 munity facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$163,066,000.

21 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

22 AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

23 Various locations: Supply facilities, and utilities,
24 \$696,000.

1 ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

2 Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training
3 facilities, \$380,000.

4 Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training
5 facilities, \$710,000.

6 King Salmon Airport: Operational and training facili-
7 ties, \$340,000.

8 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
9 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities,
10 administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities,
11 utilities and ground improvements, and real estate,
12 \$24,986,000.

13 CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

14 Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and
15 training facilities, \$1,540,000.

16 MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

17 Various locations: Maintenance facilities, supply facili-
18 ties, community facilities, and utilities, \$5,347,000.

19 PACIFIC AIR FORCES

20 Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Opera-
21 tional and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$144,000.

22 Midway Island: Supply facilities, \$839,000.

23 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
24 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-
25 munity facilities, and utilities, \$15,688,000.

1 STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

2 Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Operational and train-
3 ing facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities,
4 \$1,508,000.

5 Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and
6 training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facili-
7 ties, \$643,000.

8 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
9 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, family housing, troop
10 housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$21,431,000.

11 UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

12 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
13 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities,
14 administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, com-
15 munity facilities, and utilities, \$19,952,000.

16 AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

17 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
18 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities,
19 administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, com-
20 munity facilities, and utilities, \$29,135,000.

21 SPECIAL FACILITIES

22 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
23 \$315,000.

24 SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish

1 or develop classified military installations and facilities for
2 ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles by acquiring, con-
3 structing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent
4 or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
5 preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the
6 total amount of \$287,500,000.

7 SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish
8 or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceed-
9 ing with construction made necessary by changes in Air
10 Force missions, new weapons developments, new and un-
11 foreseen research and development requirements, or im-
12 proved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense de-
13 termines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in
14 the next military construction authorization Act would be
15 inconsistent with interests of national security, and in con-
16 nection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate,
17 or install permanent or temporary public works, including
18 land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities,
19 and equipment, in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Pro-*
20 *vided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee,
21 shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate
22 and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching
23 a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of
24 any public work undertaken under this section, including
25 those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

1 SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of
2 section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119,
3 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is author-
4 ized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family
5 housing for occupancy as public quarters and community
6 facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign cur-
7 rencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricul-
8 tural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68
9 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the
10 Commodity Credit Corporation:

11 Lajes Field, Azores, 306 units.

12 Kindley Air Force Base, Bermuda, 300 units.

13 Laon, France, 102 units.

14 Keflavik Airport, Iceland, 300 units.

15 Benguerir Airport, Morocco, 248 units.

16 Sidi Slimane Air Base, Morocco, 295 units.

17 Clark Air Force Base, Philippines, 900 units.

18 Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, 200 units.

19 Madrid-Torrejon area, Spain, 460 units.

20 Moron-San Pablo area, Spain, 40 units.

21 Various locations, Spain, 120 units, and community
22 facilities.

23 Zaragoza Air Base, Spain, 176 units.

24 Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 50 units.

25 Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 190 units.

1 Bruntingthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 93
2 units.

3 Brize Norton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 215 units.

4 Chelveston RAF Station, United Kingdom, 79 units.

5 Chicksands Priory RAF Station, United Kingdom, 83
6 units.

7 Fairford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 177 units.

8 High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 110
9 units.

10 Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 55 units,
11 and community facilities.

12 Stansted-Mountfitchet RAF Station, United Kingdom,
13 22 units.

14 Upper Heyford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 259
15 units.

16 Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, 416 units.

17 (b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of
18 the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as
19 amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to
20 construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters
21 at the following locations:

22 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

23 Camp Adair Air Force Station, Oregon, 150 units.

24 Amarillo Air Force Base, Texas, 500 units.

25 Beale Air Force Base, California, 970 units.

- 1 Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 250 units.
- 2 Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, 450 units.
- 3 Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 536 units.
- 4 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 50 units.
- 5 Custer Air Force Station, Michigan, 169 units.
- 6 Donaldson Air Force Base, South Carolina, 275 units.
- 7 Cooke Air Force Base, California, 525 units.
- 8 Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 500 units.
- 9 Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 530 units.
- 10 Duluth Municipal Airport, Minnesota, 365 units.
- 11 Edwards Air Force Base, California, 778 units.
- 12 Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 220 units.
- 13 Forbes Air Force Base, Kansas, 414 units.
- 14 Custer Air Force Station, Michigan, 169 units.
- 15 Fort Lee Air Force Station, Virginia, 154 units.
- 16 Geiger Field, Washington, 168 units.
- 17 Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 460 units.
- 18 Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 744 units.
- 19 Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, 270 units.
- 20 Hamilton Air Force Base, California, 550 units.
- 21 Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, 400 units.
- 22 James Connally Air Force Base, Texas, 366 units.
- 23 Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 290 units.
- 24 Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 475 units.
- 25 K. I. Sawyer Airport, Michigan, 595 units.

- 1 Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, 490 units.
- 2 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Louisiana, 300 units.
- 3 Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, 500 units.
- 4 Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 200 units.
- 5 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio, 400 units.
- 6 Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 150 units.
- 7 Mather Air Force Base, California, 220 units.
- 8 McChord Air Force Base, Washington, 1,000 units.
- 9 McClellan Air Force Base, California, 540 units.
- 10 McCoy Air Force Base, Florida, 668 units.
- 11 McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, 1,450 units.
- 12 Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 932 units.
- 13 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 270 units.
- 14 Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, 200 units.
- 15 Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, New York, 290 units.
- 16 Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 616 units.
- 17 Oxnard Air Force Base, California, 315 units.
- 18 Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, 483 units.
- 19 Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.
- 20 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wisconsin, 900 units.
- 21 Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Missouri, 610 units.
- 22 Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, 150 units.
- 23 Selfridge Air Force Base, Michigan, 580 units.
- 24 Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas, 500 units.
- 25 Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa, 235 units.

- 1 Stewart Air Force Base, New York, 300 units.
- 2 Suffolk County Air Force Base, New York, 220 units.
- 3 Syracuse Air Force Station, New York, 216 units.
- 4 Topsham Air Force Station, Maine, 177 units.
- 5 Truax Field, Wisconsin, 280 units.
- 6 Turner Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units.
- 7 United States Air Force Academy, Colorado, 300 units.
- 8 Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 230 units.
- 9 Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts, 310 units.
- 10 Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 154 units.
- 11 Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, 150 units.
- 12 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 618 units.

13 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

- 14 Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, 1,050 units.
- 15 Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, 600 units.
- 16 (c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404
- 17 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652),
- 18 as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized
- 19 to acquire family housing at the following locations:
- 20 Brookley Air Force Base, Alabama, 175 units.
- 21 Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, 600 units.
- 22 Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 225 units.
- 23 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, 550 units.

1 Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, 500
2 units.

3 Hunter Air Force Base, Georgia, 500 units.

4 Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, 592 units.

5 Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, 480 units.

6 March Air Force Base, California, 644 units.

7 Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, 250 units.

8 Mitchel Air Force Base, New York, 628 units.

9 Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, 612 units.

10 Reese Air Force Base, Texas, 418 units.

11 Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, 400 units.

12 Walker Air Force Base, New Mexico, 800 units.

13 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, 2,000 units.

14 SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-
15 gress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "CONTI-
16 NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

17 Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND", with
18 respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts,
19 strike out "\$6,076,000," and insert in place thereof "\$6,-
20 522,000".

21 Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND",
22 with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton,
23 Ohio, strike out "\$14,508,000" and insert in place thereof
24 "\$15,800,000".

25 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as

1 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
2 tion 502 the amounts "\$824,300,000" and "\$1,363,-
3 189,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$826,038,000"
4 and "\$1,364,927,000", respectively.

5 SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
6 as amended, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE
7 UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

8 Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—

9 (1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport,
10 Duluth, Minnesota, strike out "\$1,469,000" and insert
11 in place thereof "\$1,636,000".

12 (2) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Fal-
13 mouth, Massachusetts, strike out "\$11,577,000" and
14 insert in place thereof "\$13,341,000".

15 Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND", with
16 respect to Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, strike out
17 "\$1,339,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,661,000".

18 Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND", with
19 respect to James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas,
20 strike out "\$4,687,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,-
21 301,000".

22 Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND",
23 with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls,
24 Montana, strike out "\$1,586,000" and insert in place thereof
25 "\$1,726,000".

1 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
2 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section
3 402 the amounts "\$811,342,000" and "\$1,447,950,000"
4 and inserting in place thereof "\$814,349,000" and "\$1,450,-
5 957,000", respectively.

6 SEC. 307. (a) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Con-
7 gress, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED
8 STATES" in section 301, as follows:

9 Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—

10 (1) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glas-
11 gow, Montana, strike out "\$2,048,000" and insert in
12 place thereof "\$2,390,000".

13 (2) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base,
14 Kansas City, Missouri, strike out "\$1,100,000" and in-
15 sert in place thereof "\$1,348,000".

16 (3) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot,
17 North Dakota, strike out "\$6,804,000" and insert in
18 place thereof "\$8,507,000".

19 (4) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth,
20 Massachusetts, strike out "\$559,000" and insert in place
21 thereof "\$615,000".

22 Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND",
23 with respect to Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas,
24 strike out "\$899,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,128,-
25 000".

1 Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND", with
 2 respect to Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas, strike out
 3 "\$460,000" and insert in place thereof "\$637,000".

4 Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

5 (1) with respect to Barksdale Air Force Base,
 6 Shreveport, Louisiana, strike out "\$3,344,000" and
 7 insert in place thereof "\$3,633,000".

8 (2) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marys-
 9 ville, California, strike out "\$7,458,000" and insert in
 10 place thereof "\$9,087,000".

11 (3) with respect to MacDill Air Force Base,
 12 Tampa, Florida, strike out "\$936,000" and insert in
 13 place thereof "\$1,268,000".

14 (4) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base,
 15 Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out "\$2,344,000"
 16 and insert in place thereof "\$2,947,000".

17 (5) with respect to Whiteman Air Force Base,
 18 Knob Noster, Missouri, strike out "\$235,000" and insert
 19 in place thereof "\$306,000".

20 (b) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is
 21 amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the
 22 amounts "\$394,076,000" and "\$601,781,000" and inserting
 23 in place thereof "\$399,755,000" and "\$607,460,000",
 24 respectively.

25 SEC. 308. (a) Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Con-

gress, is amended, under the heading "ALERT AND DISPERSAL OF STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND FORCES" in section 1, as follows:

(1) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out "\$895,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,892,000".

(2) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out "\$867,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,479,000".

(3) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out "\$4,380,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,479,000".

(4) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "\$690,000" and insert in place thereof \$969,000".

(b) Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended by striking out in section 3 the amount "\$549,670,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$552,657,000".

SEC. 309. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure "\$135,425,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure "\$139,797,000".

SEC. 310. The last paragraph under the heading "RE-

1 SEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND" in title III of
2 Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress (69 Stat. 342),
3 is amended to read as follows:

4 "Various Locations: Research, development, and opera-
5 tional facilities (including not more than \$357,000 for an
6 off-base roadway approximately ten miles in length in the
7 vicinity of the north boundary of Cape Canaveral—an aux-
8 iliary to Patrick Air Force Base) \$20,000,000."

9 The amendment made by this section is effective from
10 March 1, 1956.

11 TITLE IV

12 SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or
13 develop installations and facilities required for advanced
14 research projects and in connection therewith may acquire,
15 construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or
16 temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
17 preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the
18 total amount of \$50,000,000.

19 The Secretary of Defense shall report in detail semi-
20 annually to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker
21 of the House of Representatives with respect to the exer-
22 cise of the authority granted by this title.

1 TITLE V

2 GENERAL PROVISIONS

3 SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary
4 of each military department may proceed to establish or
5 develop installations and facilities under this Act without
6 regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as
7 amended (31 U. S. C. 529, 40 U. S. C. 259, 267), and
8 sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States
9 Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary im-
10 provements on land includes authority for surveys, admin-
11 istration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to
12 construction. That authority may be exercised before title
13 to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised
14 Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C. 255), and even though
15 the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real
16 estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to
17 acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary
18 use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned
19 land, or otherwise.

20 SEC. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such
21 sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but
22 appropriations, for public works projects authorized by titles
23 I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

24 (1) for title I: Inside the United States,
25 \$112,218,000; outside the United States, \$8,732,000;

1 section 102, \$201,121,000; section 103, \$10,000,000;
2 or a total of \$332,071,000.

3 (2) for title II: Inside the United States,
4 \$217,363,000; outside the United States, \$16,384,000;
5 section 202, \$75,301,000; section 203, \$10,000,000;
6 or a total of \$319,048,000.

7 (3) for title III: Inside the United States,
8 \$536,218,000; outside the United States, \$123,654,000;
9 section 302, \$287,500,000; section 303, \$10,000,000;
10 or a total of \$957,372,000.

11 (4) for title IV: \$50,000,000.

12 SEC. 503. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and
13 III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary con-
14 cerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside
15 the United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside
16 the United States. However, the total cost of all projects
17 in each such title may not be more than the total amount
18 authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

19 SEC. 504. Any outstanding authority heretofore pro-
20 vided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119),
21 the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of
22 August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991), for the provision of family
23 housing shall be available for the construction of family
24 housing at any installations for which appropriated fund

1 family housing is authorized to be constructed under titles
2 I and III of this Act.

3 SEC. 505. Whenever—

4 (1) the President determines that compliance with
5 section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for
6 contracts made under this Act for the establishment or
7 development of military installations and facilities in
8 foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of
9 this Act; and

10 (2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller
11 General have agreed upon alternative methods of ade-
12 quately auditing those contracts; the President may
13 exempt those contracts from the requirements of that
14 section.

15 SEC. 506. Contracts made by the United States under
16 this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a com-
17 petitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national
18 security will not be impaired and the award is consistent
19 with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and sec-
20 tion 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547, 551).
21 The Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the mili-
22 tary departments shall report semi-annually to the Presi-
23 dent of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Repre-
24 sentatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other
25 than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

1 SEC. 507. As of July 1, 1959, all authorization for mili-
2 tary public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of
3 a military department in connection with the establishment
4 or development of military installations and facilities, and all
5 authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained
6 in Acts approved before August 4, 1956, and not superseded
7 or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed,
8 except—

9 (1) authorizations for public works and for appro-
10 priations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the
11 titles that contain the general provisions;

12 (2) the authorization for public works projects
13 as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for
14 construction contracts or land acquisition in whole or
15 in part before July 1, 1959, and authorizations for
16 appropriations therefor;

17 (3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for
18 family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is
19 contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952
20 (66 Stat. 606, 622) ;

21 (4) the authorizations for public works and the
22 appropriation of funds that are contained in sections
23 2231–2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended
24 (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886) ;

25 (5) the authorization for the development of the

1 Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$30,-
2 000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the
3 Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609) ;

4 (6) the authorization for development of classified
5 facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in
6 title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951
7 (65 Stat. 336, 343) ;

8 (7) the authorization for public works and for the
9 appropriation of funds that are contained in the Act of
10 April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47) , as amended; and

11 (8) notwithstanding the provision of section 506 of
12 the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 558), the
13 authorization for:

14 (a) jet engine test cells in the amount of \$1,-
15 850,000 at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia,
16 that is contained in title II, section 201 under the
17 heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and sub-
18 heading "AVIATION FACILITIES" of the Act of
19 August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 440, 442) , as amended;

20 (b) ammunition storage facilities in the
21 amount of \$225,000 at the Naval Auxiliary Air
22 Station, El Centro, California; navigational aids in
23 the amount of \$590,000 at the Marine Corps Air
24 Station, El Toro, California; research and develop-
25 ment facilities in the amount of \$1,804,000 at the

1 Naval Air Turbine Test Station, Trenton, New Jer-
2 sey; and navigational aids in the amount of
3 \$400,000 at the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island,
4 Washington: that are contained in title II, section
5 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED
6 STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES"
7 of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 540),
8 as amended;

9 (c) the development of aviation ordnance facili-
10 ties in the amount of \$2,638,000 that is contained
11 in title II, section 202, of the Act of July 27, 1954
12 (68 Stat. 535, 543), as amended;

13 (d) the development of ammunition storage
14 depot and ammunition loading terminal facilities,
15 Point Aux Pins Area, Alabama-Mississippi, in the
16 amount of \$44,168,000 that is contained in title I,
17 section 101, of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat.
18 535, 536), as amended.

19 SEC. 508. Section 408 (b) of the Act of June 17, 1950
20 (64 Stat. 236, 245), is hereby repealed.

21 SEC. 509. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955
22 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to
23 read as follows:

24 "SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1958 through and in-
25 cluding 1961, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air

1 Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities
2 at or near military tactical installations for assignment as
3 public quarters to military personnel and their dependents,
4 if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the
5 Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack
6 of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical
7 installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a
8 family or individual unit basis and not more than five thou-
9 sand of such units may be so leased at any one time. Ex-
10 penditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be
11 made out of appropriations available for maintenance and
12 operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such
13 unit.”

14 SEC. 510. Section 406 of the Act of August 3, 1956
15 (70 Stat 991, 1015), is amended to read as follows:

16 “SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of a military department
17 may acquire any interest in land that—

18 “(1) he or his designee determines is needed in the
19 interest of national defense; and

20 “(2) does not cost more than \$25,000 (exclusive of
21 administrative costs and the amounts of any deficiency
22 judgments).

23 This section does not authorize the acquisition, as part of
24 the same project, of two or more contiguous parcels of land
25 that together cost more than \$25,000.”

1 SEC. 511. Section 408 (a) of the Act of August 3,
2 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), is amended by adding the fol-
3 lowing new subsection at the end thereof:

4 “(5) No determination that a project is urgently re-
5 quired shall be necessary for projects, the cost of which is
6 not in excess of \$5,000.”

7 SEC. 512. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act
8 of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), is amended to read
9 as follows:

10 “(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law,
11 and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be
12 contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installa-
13 tions or activities unless the actual number of units involved
14 has been specifically authorized by an annual military con-
15 struction authorization Act except (1) housing units required
16 to be acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404
17 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) housing units
18 leased, utilizing available operation and maintenance appro-
19 priations, for terms of one year, whether renewable or not,
20 or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the pro-
21 visions of section 417 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat.
22 991, 1018); and (3) rental guaranty family housing author-
23 ized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat.
24 606, 622); and (4) to the extent that any of the author-
25 ization of subsection 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b) of

1 this Act to construct housing at locations specified therein
2 are not utilized, such authorization may be exercised to con-
3 struct housing at other locations: *Provided*, That the total
4 number of housing units to be constructed under the authority
5 of this subsection may not exceed for any service 10 per
6 centum of the total number of units authorized in its sub-
7 section: *Provided, further*, That the Secretaries of the three
8 military departments, or the designee of each, shall notify
9 the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House
10 of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision
11 to utilize the authority granted by this section.

12 TITLE VI

13 RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

14 SEC. 601. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as
15 follows:

16 (1) That part of section 2233 (a) that precedes clause
17 (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

18 “§ 2233. Acquisition

19 “(a) Subject to sections 2233a, 2234, 2235, 2236, and
20 2238 of this title and subsection (c) of this section, the
21 Secretary of Defense may—”.

22 (2) Section 2233 is amended by adding the following
23 new subsections at the end thereof:

24 “(e) The Secretary of Defense may procure advance
25 planning, construction design, and architectural services in

1 connection with facilities to be established or developed under
 2 this chapter which are not otherwise authorized by law.”

3 “(f) Facilities authorized by subsection (a) shall not
 4 be considered ‘military public works’ under the provisions of
 5 the military construction authorization acts that repeal prior
 6 authorizations for military public works.”

7 (3) The following new section is inserted after section
 8 2233:

9 “§ 2233a. Limitation

10 “No expenditure or contribution that is more than
 11 \$50,000 may be made under section 2233 of this title for
 12 any facility that has not been authorized by a law authoriz-
 13 ing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces.
 14 This requirement does not apply to the following:

15 “(a) Facilities acquired by lease.

16 “(b) Facilities acquired, constructed, expanded, re-
 17 habilitated, converted, or equipped to restore or replace
 18 facilities damaged or destroyed, where the Senate and the
 19 House of Representatives have been notified of that ac-
 20 tion.”

21 (4) The analysis of chapter 133 is amended by inserting
 22 the following new item:

“2233a. Limitation.”

23 SEC. 602. (a) Section 3 of the National Defense Facil-
 24 ities Act of 1950, as amended by paragraph (a) of the Act

1 of August 9, 1955, chapter 662 (69 Stat. 593), and by
2 section 2 of the Act of August 29, 1957, Public Law 85-215
3 (71 Stat. 489), is amended by striking out the words "in an
4 amount not to exceed \$580,000,000 over a period of the next
5 eight fiscal years commencing with fiscal year 1951,".

6 (b) Section 3 (a) of the National Defense Facilities
7 Act of 1950, as amended by section 414 of the Act of
8 August 3, 1956, chapter 939 (70 Stat. 1018), is amended
9 by striking out the words "and without regard to the mone-
10 tary limitation otherwise imposed by this section".

11 SEC. 603. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United
12 States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or de-
13 velop the following facilities for reserve forces:

14 (1) For Department of the Navy:

15 NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

16 Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta,
17 Georgia: Training facilities, \$480,000.

18 Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Supply facilities and
19 utilities, \$259,000.

20 Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance fa-
21 cilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$652,000.

22 Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Navigational aids
23 and utilities, \$179,000.

24 Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Airfield light-
25 ing, \$147,000.

1 Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Opera-
2 tional and training facilities, liquid fueling and dispensing fa-
3 cilities, airfield lighting, and land acquisition, \$1,992,000.

4 Naval Air Station, New Orleans (Alvin Callender
5 Field), Louisiana: Administrative facilities, community fa-
6 cilities, navigational aids, operational facilities, supply facili-
7 ties, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,447,000.

8 Naval Air Station, New York, New York: Airfield
9 lighting, \$130,000.

10 Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Opera-
11 tional and training facilities, and utilities, \$652,000.

12 Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational and
13 training facilities, \$570,000.

14 Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts:
15 Utilities, \$407,000.

16 Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Utili-
17 ties, \$99,000.

18 NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

19 Alameda, California: Waterfront operational facilities,
20 \$128,000.

21 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Bloomington, In-
22 diana: Training facilities, \$95,000.

23 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Bos-
24 ton, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$108,000.

1 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Centralia, Washing-
2 ton: Training facilities, \$81,000.

3 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Chillicothe, Ohio:
4 Training facilities, \$100,000.

5 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Danville, Ken-
6 tucky: Training facilities, \$84,000.

7 Naval Reserve Training Center, Dunkirk, New York:
8 Training facilities, \$79,000.

9 Fort Schuyler, New York: Waterfront operational facili-
10 ties, \$120,000.

11 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Hayward, Califor-
12 nia: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$99,000.

13 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center,
14 Honolulu, Hawaii: Training facilities, \$515,000.

15 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Iowa City, Iowa:
16 Training facilities \$97,000.

17 Master Control Radio Station, New Orleans, Louisiana:
18 Communications, \$210,000.

19 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Olympia (Tum-
20 water), Washington: Training facilities, \$47,000.

21 Naval Reserve Training Center, Pasadena, California:
22 Training facilities, \$132,000.

23 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Port Chicago, Cali-
24 fornia: Training facilities, \$94,000.

1 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San
2 Jose, California: Land acquisition, \$78,000.

3 Saint Petersburg, Florida: Waterfront operational facili-
4 ties, \$26,000.

5 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center,
6 Steubenville, Ohio: Land acquisition, \$18,000.

7 Naval Reserve Training Center, White Oak (Lewiston),
8 Maryland: Training facilities, \$557,000.

9 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Yakima, Washing-
10 ton: Training facilities, \$48,000.

11 MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)

12 Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Lynchburg,
13 Virginia: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$388,000.

14 Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Memphis, Ten-
15 nessee: Training facilities, \$453,000.

16 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center,
17 Moline, Illinois: Training facilities, \$152,000.

18 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center,
19 Pasadena, California: Training facilities, \$163,000.

20 (2) For Department of the Air Force:

21 AIR FORCE RESERVE

22 Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland:
23 Operational and training facilities, \$129,000.

24 Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, utilities and ground improve-
2 ments, and land acquisition, \$3,174,000.

3 Bates Field, Mobile, Alabama: Maintenance facility,
4 \$97,000.

5 Bradley Field, Windsor Locks, Connecticut: Mainte-
6 nance facility and utilities and ground improvements,
7 \$160,000.

8 Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Maintenance facility,
9 and supply facility, \$325,000.

10 General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Main-
11 tenance facility, and operational and training facilities,
12 \$173,000.

13 Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, New Hampshire:
14 Operational and training facilities, \$180,000.

15 Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Belton, Missouri:
16 Operational and training facilities, \$101,000.

17 Naval Air Station (Alvin Callender Field), Orleans
18 Parish, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities,
19 \$622,000.

20 Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Main-
21 tenance facility, \$93,000.

22 AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

23 Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational
24 and training facilities, and hospital and medical facilities,
25 \$171,000.

1 Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts: Operational and
2 training facilities, \$740,000.

3 Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel, Minnesota:
4 Site improvements, \$500,000.

5 Birmingham Municipal Airport, Birmingham, Alabama:
6 Operational and training facilities, \$150,000.

7 Byrd Field, Richmond, Virginia: Supply facilities,
8 \$50,000.

9 Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational
10 and training facilities, \$579,000.

11 Capital Airport, Springfield, Illinois: Supply facilities,
12 \$78,000.

13 Des Moines Municipal Airport, Des Moines, Iowa:
14 Operational and training facilities, \$53,000.

15 Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Operational and
16 training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and
17 utilities and ground improvements, \$1,308,000.

18 Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, New Hampshire:
19 Operational and training facilities, \$170,000.

20 Gulfport Municipal Airport, Gulfport, Mississippi:
21 Supply facilities, \$362,000.

22 Hayward Municipal Airport, Hayward, California:
23 Operational and training facilities, \$113,000.

24 Hensley Field, Grand Prairie, Texas: Operational and
25 training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,862,000.

1 Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational and train-
2 ing facilities, and supply facilities, \$159,000.

3 Kellogg Field, Battle Creek, Michigan: Operational and
4 training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and
5 ground improvements, \$1,136,000.

6 Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:
7 Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,
8 \$570,000.

9 Martinsburg Municipal Airport, Martinsburg, West Vir-
10 ginia: Operational and training facilities, \$123,000.

11 O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Opera-
12 tional and training facilities, \$1,099,000.

13 Ontario International Airport, Ontario, California:
14 Operational and training facilities, \$127,000.

15 Portland Municipal Airport, Portland, Oregon: Supply
16 facilities and maintenance facilities, \$233,000.

17 Rosecrans Field, Saint Joseph, Missouri: Operational
18 and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$123,000.

19 San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico:
20 Supply facilities, \$70,000.

21 Sky Harbor Airport, Phoenix, Arizona: Operational and
22 training facilities, \$655,000.

23 Standiford Field, Louisville, Kentucky: Operational and
24 training facilities, and administrative facilities, \$715,000.

1 Theodore F. Green Airport, Providence, Rhode Island:

2 Operational and training facilities, \$213,000.

3 Travis Field, Savannah, Georgia: Housing, supply fa-
4 cilities and utilities, \$317,000.

5 Various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, \$300,000.

6 (3) For Department of the Army:

7 ARMY RESERVE

8 Batavia, New York: Training facilities, \$171,000.

9 Beckley, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$289,000.

10 Beloit, Wisconsin: Training facilities, \$157,000.

11 Canandaigua, New York: Training facilities, \$171,000.

12 Canton, Ohio: Training facilities, \$40,000.

13 Cheyenne, Wyoming: Training facilities, \$149,000.

14 Durant, Oklahoma: Training facilities, \$141,000.

15 Fargo, North Dakota: Training facilities, \$149,000.

16 Fremont, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.

17 Galesburg, Illinois: Training facilities, \$157,000.

18 Greenwood, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$85,000.

19 Hempstead, New York (Nr2): Training facilities,
20 \$536,000.

21 Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$99,000.

22 Kewaunee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, \$157,000.

23 Madison, Wisconsin (Nr2): Training facilities,
24 \$490,000.

1 Oklahoma City, Oklahoma (Nr2): Training facilities,
2 \$443,000.

3 Saint Marys, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.

4 Saint Marys, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$149,000.

5 Salinas, California: Training facilities, \$164,000.

6 Sinton, Texas: Training facilities, \$134,000.

7 Stockton, California: Training facilities, \$164,000.

8 Warren, Ohio: Training facilities, \$289,000.

9 Weirton, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$149,000.

10 Land acquisition: Training facilities, \$419,000.

11 ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

12 (ARMORY)

13 Ackerman, Mississippi: Training facilities, \$54,000.

14 Agawam, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$170,000.

15 Ashford, Alabama: Training facilities, \$70,000.

16 Beckley, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$200,000.

17 Belton, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$122,000.

18 Berryville, Arkansas: Training facilities \$45,000.

19 Berryville, Virginia: Training facilities,\$135,000.

20 Bethel, Alaska: Training facilities, \$480,000.

21 Caldwell, Ohio: Training facilities, \$135,000.

22 Calhoun, Georgia: Training facilities, \$110,000.

23 Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$206,000.

24 Espanola, New Mexico: Training facilities, \$57,000.

- 1 Fairbanks, Alaska: Training facilities, \$277,000.
- 2 Gainesville, Texas: Training facilities, \$111,000.
- 3 Hollister, California: Training facilities, \$105,000.
- 4 Honey Grove, Texas: Training facilities, \$90,000.
- 5 Juncos, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, \$38,000.
- 6 Livingston, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
- 7 Lovell, Wyoming: Training facilities, \$142,000.
- 8 Mayaguez, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, \$160,000.
- 9 Middleboro, Kentucky: Training facilities, \$130,000.
- 10 Northwest Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities,
11 \$130,000.
- 12 Pitman, New Jersey: Training facilities, \$175,000.
- 13 Rigby, Idaho: Training facilities, \$57,000.
- 14 Salem, South Dakota: Training facilities, \$150,000.
- 15 Saranac Lake, New York: Training facilities, \$300,000.
- 16 Shallotte, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$95,000.
- 17 Smithfield, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.
- 18 South Portland, Maine: Training facilities, \$150,000.
- 19 Sturgis, Michigan: Training facilities, \$220,000.
- 20 Swanton, Vermont: Training facilities, \$137,000.
- 21 Valparaiso, Indiana: Training facilities, \$188,000.
- 22 Whitman, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$170,000.
- 23 Whitmire, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
- 24 Winnemucca, Nevada: Training facilities, \$110,000.

1 ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (NON-
2 ARMORY)

3 Augusta, Maine: Administrative facilities, \$90,000.

4 Burlington, Vermont: Supply facilities, \$208,000.

5 Camp Beauregard, Louisiana: Supply facilities, \$325,-
6 000.

7 Camp Dodge, Iowa: Supply facilities, \$120,000.

8 Concord, New Hampshire: Supply facilities, \$145,000.

9 Kalispell, Montana: Maintenance facilities, \$67,000.

10 Trenton, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, \$80,000.

11 (4) For all reserve components: Facilities made nec-
12 essary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equip-
13 ment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his
14 designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclu-
15 sion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific
16 facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the in-
17 terests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense
18 or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Repre-
19 sentatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to
20 implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility
21 to be undertaken under this subsection.

22 SEC. 604. The first sentence of section 2233a of title 10,
23 United States Code, does not apply to—

24 (a) facilities that—

25 (1) have been the subject of consultation with

the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives before July 1, 1958;

(2) are under contract before July 1, 1960; and

(3) are funded from appropriations made before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(b) facilities that are authorized by section 603 (4) of this Act; or

(c) The following facilities for the Air National Guard of the United States.

(1) Milford Point, Connecticut: Operational and training facilities, \$337,000.

(2) Wellesley, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, \$319,000.

(3) Westchester County Airport, White Plains, New York: Operational and training facilities, \$105,000.

SEC. 605. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this Title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and section 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is

1 held temporarily. The authority to acquire real esetate or
2 land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land,
3 and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift,
4 purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

5 SEC. 606. Appropriations for facilities projects author-
6 ized by section 603 for the respective reserve components
7 of the armed forces may not exceed—

8 (1) for Department of the Navy: Naval and
9 Marine Corps Reserves, \$11,886,000.

10 (2) for Department of the Air Force:

11 (a) Air Force Reserve, \$5,054,000;

12 (b) Air National Guard of the United States,
13 \$11,976,000.

14 (3) for Department of the Army: Army Reserve
15 and Army National Guard of the United States,
16 \$11,042,000.

17 SEC. 607. Any of the amounts named in section 603 of
18 this Act may in, the discretion of the Secretary of Defense,
19 be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all
20 projects authorized for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves,
21 the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard of the United
22 States, and the Army Reserve and the Army National
23 Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts

1 named in clauses 1, 2 (a), 2 (b), and 3 of section 606 re-
2 spectively.

3 SEC. 608. This title may be cited as the “Reserve
4 Forces Facilities Act of 1958”.

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VINSON

JUNE 18, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 25, 1958
For actions of June 24, 1958
85th-2d, No. 104

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	1,34	
Buildings.....	32	
Civil defense.....	9	
Conservation.....	23	
Corn.....	11	
Cotton.....	11,12,43	
Dairy program.....	6	
Defense production.....	40	Future farmers.....17
Depressed areas.....	27	Grain.....44
Education.....	33	Housing.....18
Electrification.....	5	Laws.....46
Employment.....	42	Military construction...10
Farm prices.....	16	Milk.....26
Farm program.....	11,22	Natural resources.....19
Food prices.....	21	Personnel.....2,45
Foreign aid.....	3	Public works.....4,36
Foreign trade.....	7	Reclamation.....14
Forestry.....	31	Renegotiation.....30
		Reorganization.....35
		Research.....20,29
		Rice.....11
		Small business.....41
		Statehood.....13
		Surplus commodities.....7
		Surplus property.....28
		Taxation.....8
		Textiles.....39
		Transportation..8,15,24,37
		Wildlife.....25,38

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee agreed to report original farm bill. Sen. Stennis opposed reductions in cotton acreage allotments. Rep. Johnson explained proposed self-help dairy stabilization program. Mutual security authorization bill returned to conference. House committee reported bill to authorize training of Federal employees at outside facilities. Sen. Humphrey introduced and discussed measure to extend special milk program for 60 days.

HOUSE

- 1. APPROPRIATIONS.** Received the conference report on H. R. 12428, the State-Justice and related agencies appropriation bill for 1959 (H. Rept. 1980). pp. 10928-929
Conferees were granted until midnight June 24, to file a report on H. R. 11574, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1959. p. 10919
Passed with amendment H. R. 13066, the legislative branch appropriation bill for 1959. pp. 10919-928
Reps. Bow and Passman charged that there "is a growing tendency of other branches of government, particularly the executive branch of the Government in its attempt to pressure the Congress of the United States in its decisions," particularly with regard to appropriations. pp. 10921-922
- 2. PERSONNEL.** The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendment S. 385, to authorize the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities (H. Rept. 1951). p. 10993

Rep. Porter stated that ICA has followed a policy of "making employment contingent on political clearance," but he has been assured that employment "is based on individual qualification and merit," and inserted numerous articles and letters discussing the matter. pp. 10976-982

3. FOREIGN AID. At the request of Rep. Morgan the conference report on H. R. 12181, the mutual security authorization bill, was returned to conference, with permission until midnight Wed., June 25, to file a new conference report on the bill. p. 10976
4. PUBLIC WORKS. Received the conference report on S. 3910, the rivers and harbors and flood control authorization bill (H. Rept. 1982). pp. 10934-943
5. ELECTRIFICATION. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy ordered reported clean bills in lieu of S. 3788 and H. R. 12459, authorizing appropriations for certain Atomic Energy Commission activities including the cooperative power reactor demonstration program. p. D587
6. DAIRY PROGRAM. Rep. Johnson urged support for the proposed self-help dairy stabilization program contained in the omnibus farm bill, H. R. 12954, and inserted a statement of questions and answers he had prepared explaining the proposed program. pp. 10972-974
7. FOREIGN TRADE; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Rep. Reuss discussed the effects of the Public Law 480 program on other countries, stated that "other friendly countries -- including some of the best friends that we have -- have been turned away from us by the way the act has been administered," and inserted statements of the reactions of other countries toward the program. pp. 10974-976
8. TRANSPORTATION TAXES. Several Representatives urged adoption of a Senate amendment to H. R. 12695, the excise-tax rate extension bill, which would repeal the tax on transportation. pp. 10917, 10971, 10972
9. CIVIL DEFENSE. The Armed Services Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12827, to extend certain emergency powers of the FCDA until June 30, 1962 (H. Rept. 1956). p. 10993
10. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. The Armed Services Committee reported with amendment H. R. 13015, to authorize construction at military installations (H. Rept. 1957). p. 10993

SENATE

11. FARM PROGRAM. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee agreed to report an original farm bill, "containing: (1) alternative price support programs for cotton, (2) minimum acreage and discretionary price supports between 75 percent and 90 percent for rice, and (3) price supports for corn at 90 percent of the average price for the three preceding calendar years, with no production controls." p. D583
12. COTTON ACREAGE. Sen. Stennis spoke against further reductions in acreage allotments for cotton, and urged that each cotton farmer be assured of the same acreage in 1959 as in 1958, and that future increases in allotments be distributed "equally" among producers. He indicated his willingness to agree to reduced price supports, and urged that a group of Congressmen talk to the President about this matter. Sen. Yarborough concurred. pp. 10853-5

AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION FOR THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS AND RESERVE COMPONENTS

JUNE 24, 1958.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. VINSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the
following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 13015]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 2, line 22, strike "\$1,795,000" and insert "795,000".

On page 4, following line 11, add the following: "facilities, and hospital facilities, \$3,505,000."

On page 9, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following: "Fort Bragg, North Carolina, 367 units."

On page 18, line 8, place a period after the word "made" and strike the remainder of that line and all of line 9.

On page 18, line 25, strike the word "to".

On page 19, following line 3, insert "TITLE II".

On page 29, following line 14, insert the following:

"Naval Base, San Diego, California, 1000 units."

On page 53, strike all of line 14.

EXPLANATION OF THE AMENDMENTS

The first amendment, on page 2, merely corrects a typographical error.

The second amendment, on page 4, adds language which, through inadvertence, was left out of the bill.

The third amendment, on page 9, inserts authority for the construction of 367 units of Capehart housing at Fort Bragg, N. C. This

item was in the original bill but was stricken while the committee made a further investigation of the housing requirements at this installation. After further study of the matter, the committee concluded that these units should be reinserted in the bill.

The fourth amendment, on page 18, line 8, is designed to render it entirely clear that normal practice will be followed in the sale of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot property and that interest will be paid by any purchaser on any amounts not paid at the time of purchase.

The fifth amendment, on page 18, line 25, merely corrects a typographical error.

The sixth amendment, on page 19, inserts "TITLE II" which was inadvertently omitted from the printed bill.

The seventh amendment, on page 29, inserts a new item of 1,000 units of Capehart housing at the Naval Base, San Diego, Calif. This housing had been approved by all appropriate authorities within the Department of Defense but had not been included in the original program as such appeared in the original bill, H. R. 12360.

The ninth amendment is designed to strike from the bill an item which appears twice on that page.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to provide construction and other related authority for the military departments within and outside the United States, and (in title VI) authority for construction of facilities for the Reserve components.

TOTAL AUTHORIZATIONS GRANTED

BRIEF OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Title I (Army):	
Inside continental United States.....	\$112, 218, 000
Outside continental United States.....	8, 732, 000
Classified.....	201, 121, 000
Emergency construction.....	10, 000, 000
Total.....	332, 071, 000
Title II (Navy):	
Inside continental United States.....	217, 363, 000
Outside continental United States.....	16, 384, 000
Classified.....	75, 301, 000
Emergency construction.....	10, 000, 000
Total.....	319, 048, 000
Title III (Air Force):	
Inside continental United States.....	536, 218, 000
Outside continental United States.....	123, 654, 000
Classified.....	287, 500, 000
Emergency construction.....	10, 000, 000
Total.....	957, 372, 000
Title IV (Department of Defense): Advanced Research Projects	
Agency.....	50, 000, 000
Subtotal.....	1, 658, 491, 000
Deficiency authorizations:	
Title I (Army).....	30, 847, 000
Title II (Navy).....	15, 825, 000
Title III (Air Force).....	17, 783, 000
Total.....	64, 455, 000
Title VI (Reserve components):	
Naval and Marine Corps Reserves.....	11, 886, 000
Air Force Reserve.....	5, 054, 000
Air National Guard.....	11, 976, 000
Army Reserve and Army National Guard.....	11, 042, 000
Total.....	39, 958, 000
Grand total of all authorities granted by titles I, II, III, IV, and VI.....	
	1, 762, 904, 000

DEFICIENCY AUTHORIZATIONS

In titles I, II, and III of the bill are found items which amend prior public laws so as to increase the authorizations for projects, the initiation of which was authorized in past years. These amendments, for the most part, are to defray deficiencies in authorizations previously granted and are necessary because of the general rise in construction costs throughout the world. In only one instance, that relating to the movement of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, is any increase in the scope of a project involved.

RESERVE COMPONENTS

All of the details relating to the construction for Reserve components contained in this bill appear later in the report. The committee felt that the report should be divided in this fashion since the types of construction items for the reserve components and the considerations dictating the requirements for such are for the most part unrelated to the regular military construction program.

STATUS OF MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION

In order that the House may review the status of all military construction authorization through fiscal years 1948 to date, the following summary is provided (all figures represent \$1,000,000):

	Army	Navy	Air Force	Total
Total authorizations, fiscal year 1948 through fiscal year 1958.....	4,401	3,734	12,168	20,303
Less unfunded authorizations repealed and rescinded through fiscal year 1957.....	-629	-324	-1,119	-2,072
Less estimated unfunded authorization to be repealed by sec. 506 of Public Law 85-241.....	-51	-17	-164	-232
Less appropriations, fiscal year 1948 through fiscal year 1958.....	-3,358	-3,012	-9,617	-15,987
Less dollar equivalent of counterpart fund pesetas utilized through fiscal year 1958.....	0	-26	-53	-79
Residual authorization to be available at end fiscal year 1958.....	363	355	1,215	1,933
Additional new authorization proposed by fiscal year 1959 bill.....	+347	+301	+986	+1,634
Increases in prior year's authorization proposed by fiscal year 1959 bill.....	+14	+16	+18	+48
Total of fiscal year 1958 residual and proposed fiscal year 1959 authorizations.....	724	672	2,219	3,615
Less unfunded authorization to be repealed by sec. 507 of fiscal year 1959 bill.....	-168	-73	-787	-1,028
Less proposed fiscal year 1959 appropriation.....	-341	-360	-992	-1,693
Less counterpart fund pesetas proposed for utilization in fiscal year 1959.....	0	-15	-25	-40
Residual authorization to be available at end fiscal year 1959.....	215	224	415	854

Residual authorization

The foregoing tabulation illustrates that the amount of residual authorization available to the three military departments is being steadily reduced each fiscal year. This means that each year the lowest priority projects are eliminated through the annual rescission of unfunded authorizations over 4 years old. (Sec. 507 of this year's bill will change the 4 years to 3 years and thereby speed up the process of rescission.) Consequently, the balance of residual authorization

left available is steadily being reviewed, and consists of both urgently needed projects, and other projects for which the requirement has changed due to revisions in missions and weapons.

The military departments are each using part of their annual construction appropriations to assure continued progress on the most urgent of these residual projects. The balance of their annual appropriation is applied to essential new authorizations. It is necessary that a proper balance and control be maintained between these two segments of the program, so that construction can satisfactorily proceed on both residual and new authorization, at a rate which is in proper relationship to the funds the Defense Department can make available for military construction.

Limitations on new authorizations

In order to achieve this, the amount of new authorization granted this year has been closely limited and consists mainly of additional increments on projects already underway, items required to support new weapons developments, and essential modernization of our bases.

TITLE I—ARMY

BRIEF OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Title I (Army):

Inside continental United States.....	\$112, 218, 000
Outside continental United States.....	8, 732, 000
Classified.....	201, 121, 000
Sec. 103 (locations not specified).....	10, 000, 000
Total.....	332, 071, 000

The Army would be authorized \$332,071,000 in this bill exclusive of the authorities contained in sections 105, 106, 107, 108, and 109. The new authorization granted herein is approximately \$38,968,000 more than that authorized for the fiscal year 1958.

A general résumé of major components included in the new authorization total follows:

Guided missiles

The sum of \$209.7 million, or 63 percent of the total request is directly related to the area of guided missiles. Construction for missiles falls into three groups: The surface-to-air missile program for defense of our key bases and our metropolitan and industrial centers in the United States and our key military installations overseas \$147.0 million, including \$6.3 million for logistic support facilities; research, development and test facilities for missiles \$45.7 million; expansion and modernization of facilities at specialized schools for the training of personnel in the operation and maintenance of surface-to-air and surface-to-surface missiles for a total of \$17.0 million.

Overseas areas

The sum of \$36.3 million or 10.9 percent of the total request for construction requirements in overseas base-rights areas (exclusive of surface-to-air missiles). This authorization will fulfill an urgent and high priority requirement for operational and logistic type facilities in support of United States Army Forces deployed in Europe and the Far East, in accordance with mutual defense agreements, as well as the Signal Corps' and Army Security Agency's worldwide missions.

Troop housing

The sum of \$35.9 million or 10.8 percent for troop housing in the continental United States and overseas areas, including \$26.3 million for permanent barracks, messes, and battalion administrative and supply buildings to accommodate 9,790 enlisted men, and \$3.2 million for permanent BOQ spaces to accommodate 372 officers. The remaining \$6.4 million will provide 3,644 semipermanent barracks spaces and 663 BOQ spaces at temporary installations in the continental United States and in overseas areas.

Army aviation

The sum of \$8.4 million, or 2.5 percent for construction in support of Army aviation at major installations throughout the United States and in overseas areas.

Medical facilities

The sum of \$6.6 million, or 2.0 percent for the construction of hospital and medical facilities, to include \$5.3 million for 2 permanent type hospitals.

Categories of construction

A breakdown of the program by broad categories is as follows:

Program by categories

[In thousands]

Category	Continental United States	Overseas	Total
1. Operational and training facilities.....	\$26,832	\$968	\$27,800
2. Maintenance and production facilities.....	11,134	410	11,544
3. Research and development and test facilities.....	14,899		14,899
4. Supply facilities.....	167	3,783	3,950
5. Hospital and medical facilities.....	6,488	225	6,713
6. Administrative facilities.....	9,172	780	9,952
7. Housing and community facilities.....	40,156	1,081	41,237
8. Utilities and ground improvements.....	2,872	1,478	4,350
9. Real estate.....	498	7	505
Total	112,218	8,732	120,950
Classified.....	128,463	72,653	201,121
Section 103, locations unknown.....			10,000
Grand total	240,686	81,385	332,071

PROGRAM BY MAJOR ACTIVITIES

A description of the program by major activities and the missions to be served follow:

Technical services

Ordnance Corps.—The assigned mission of the Ordnance Corps, under the direction of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, is to support Army combat forces by the provision of all weapons, ammunition, combat vehicles, ordnance general supplies, and train personnel to furnish specialized ordnance services of the types needed, when and where needed. This element of the program totals \$25,393,000 for construction at 5 installations, to include operational and training facilities, research, development and test facilities, administrative facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, representing 7.6 percent of the program.

Quartermaster Corps.—The Quartermaster General, under the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, develops, provides and services food, clothing, petroleum (except field and higher echelon maintenance of pipelines), aerial supply equipment, other quartermaster equipment, supplies, maintenance and services for the Army, and, as assigned, for the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps; provides for the disposal of Army surplus personal property, as assigned; and provides for the care and disposition of the remains and personal effects of deceased personnel of the Army and as directed or agreed upon, of the Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, and for general supervision of the operation of national cemeteries. Included in the program for the Quartermaster Corps is \$4,630,000 for construction at 1 installation to include operational and training facilities, and troop housing, representing 1.4 percent of the program.

Chemical Corps.—The mission of the Army Chemical Corps, under the direction and control of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, is to provide support to the Department of Defense (Army, Air Force, and Navy including the Marine Corps) in the fields of chemical, biological, and radiological (CBR) warfare, including smoke, flame, and incendiaries, and materiel and equipment. This mission carries with it a responsibility to assure that the Army achieves a realistic capability for operations in both offensive and defensive CBR warfare. This segment of the program totals \$2,846,000 for the construction of troop housing and utilities at 2 installations, representing 0.9 percent of the program.

Signal Corps.—The primary mission of the Signal Corps under the direction of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics is to provide communication and pictorial services for the United States Army, worldwide, and for other components of the Department of Defense as directed. The Signal Corps element of the program totals \$9,098,000 for construction of operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and utilities at 1 installation, representing 2.7 percent of the program.

Corps of Engineers.—The Corps of Engineers, a technical service and a combat arm, is the construction agency for the Department of the Army whose Chief reports to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics. The Chief of Engineers is the commander of the Corps of Engineers and the senior engineer staff officer of the Department of the Army, and as such is in charge of the entire military-civil works program of the Corps of Engineers. Construction proposed for the Corps of Engineers totals \$1,913,000 for construction at 1 installation to provide operational and training facilities representing 0.6 percent of the program.

Transportation Corps.—The Transportation Corps, a technical service under the direction of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, provides or secures transportation services for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. This element of the program totals \$3,634,000 for construction at 1 installation to provide operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities representing 1.1 percent of the total program.

Medical Corps.—The Army Medical Service, headed by the Surgeon General who reports to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, furnishes the Army Establishment, and when appropriate, members

of other uniformed services, medical and dental care, hospitalization, evacuation, preventive medicine, veterinary and other services essential to the maintenance of health. This program will provide \$862,000 for construction of 1 Medical Corps installation of troop housing, representing 0.3 percent of the total program.

Continental United States Armies

First United States Army.—The mission of the commanding general, First United States Army, a continental United States Army command, whose area includes the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont is to command the 11 installations and 6 subinstallations within the Army area, including responsibility for operations, security, training, administration, and logistical support of the active Army units and activities assigned or attached to the Army; furnish limited administrative and logistical support to additional installations commanded by the chief of an administrative service or technical service of the Department of the Army; provide for administrative and logistical support to units of the Army Air Defense Command; be responsible for organization, administration, training, logistical support, and recruiting of the Reserve components which include United States Army Reserve, Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) and, within limitations, National Guard; prepare plans for and conduct operations in internal security, military assistance to civilian authorities during emergencies, ground defense, mobilization, and other specific missions as directed; such as maintaining designated units of the strategic Reserve for rapid deployment; be responsible for joint actions with Air Force and Navy relative to recruiting, induction, operations, training, and matters of mutual interest within First Army Area. The program includes \$3,920,000 for construction at 2 installations in the First Army area, to provide operational and training facilities, troop housing and utilities, representing 1.2 percent of the program.

Second United States Army.—The mission of the commanding general, Second United States Army, a continental United States Army command, whose area includes the States of Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia, is to command the 10 installations and 2 subinstallations within the Army area, including responsibility for operations, security training, administration, and logistical support of the Active Army units and activities assigned or attached to the Army; furnish limited administrative and logistical support to additional installations commanded by the chief of an administrative service or technical service of the Department of the Army; provide for administrative and logistical support to units of the Army Air Defense Command; be responsible for organization, administration, training, logistical support, and recruiting of the Reserve components, which include United States Army Reserve, Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC), and, within limitations, National Guard; prepare plans for and conduct operations in internal security, military assistance to civilian authorities during emergencies, ground defense, mobilization, and other specific missions as directed, such as maintaining designated units of the strategic Reserve for rapid deployment; be responsible for joint actions with Air Force and Navy relative to recruiting, induction, operations, training, and matters of mutual interest within Second Army area. This element of the program con-

tains \$3,331,000 for construction at 4 installations, to provide operational and training facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, family housing, real estate and utilities, representing 1 percent of the program.

Third United States Army.—The mission of the commanding general, Third United States Army, a continental United States Army command, whose area includes the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee, is to command the 9 installations and 1 subinstallation within the Army area, including responsibility for operations, security, training, administration, and logistical support of the Active Army units and activities assigned or attached to the Army; furnish limited administrative and logistical support to additional installations commanded by the chief of an administrative service or technical service of the Department of the Army; provide for administrative and logistical support to units of the Army Air Defense Command; be responsible for organization, administration, training, logistical support, and recruiting of the Reserve components, which include United States Army Reserve, Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC), and, within limitations, National Guard; prepare plans for and conduct operations in internal security, military assistance to civilian authorities during emergencies, ground defense, mobilization, and other specific missions as directed, such as maintaining designated units of the strategic Reserve for rapid deployment; be responsible for joint actions with Air Force and Navy relative to recruiting induction, operations, training, and matters of mutual interest within Third Army area. The program includes \$10,974,000 in support of Third United States Army at 5 installations, to provide operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, family housing, and utilities, representing 3.3 percent of the program.

Fourth United States Army.—The mission of the commanding general, Fourth United States Army, a continental United States Army command, whose area includes the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas, is to command the 8 installations and 2 subinstallations within the Army area, including responsibility for operations, security, training, administration, and logistical support of the Active Army units and activities assigned or attached to the Army; furnish limited administrative and logistical support to additional installations commanded by the chief of an administrative service or technical service of the Department of the Army; provide for administrative and logistical support to units of the Army Air Defense Command; be responsible for organization, administration, training, logistical support, and recruiting of the Reserve components, which include United States Army Reserve, Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC), and, within limitations, National Guard; prepare plans for and conduct operations in internal security, military assistance to civilian authorities during emergencies, ground defense, mobilization, and other specific missions as directed, such as maintaining designated units of the strategic Reserve for rapid deployment; be responsible for joint actions with Air Force and Navy relative to recruiting, induction, operations, training, and matters of mutual interest within Fourth Army area. There is included in the program \$21,219,000 for construction at 3 installations of operational

and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, representing 6.4 percent of the total program.

Fifth United States Army.—The mission of the commanding general, Fifth United States Army, a continental United States Army command, whose area includes the States of Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming, is to command the 11 installations and 1 subinstallation within the Army area, including responsibility for operations, security, training, administration, and logistical support of the Active Army units and activities assigned or attached to the Army; furnish limited administrative and logistical support to additional installations commanded by the chief of an administrative service or technical service of the Department of the Army; provide for administrative and logistical support to units of the Army Air Defense Command; be responsible for organization, administration, training, logistical support, and recruiting of the Reserve components, which include United States Army Reserve, Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC), and, within limitations, National Guard; prepare plans for and conduct operations in internal security, military assistance to civilian authorities during emergencies, ground defense, mobilization, and other specific missions as directed, such as maintaining designated units of the strategic Reserve for rapid deployment; be responsible for joint actions with Air Force and Navy relative to recruiting, induction, operations, training, and matters of mutual interest within Fifth Army area. The Fifth Army element of the program totals \$2,943,000 for construction at 3 installations, to provide operational and training facilities, troop housing, family housing and utilities, representing 0.9 percent of the total program.

Sixth United States Army.—The mission of the commanding general, Sixth United States Army, a continental United States Army command, whose area includes the State of Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington, is to command the 10 installations and 10 subinstallations within the Army area, including responsibility for operations, security, training, administration, and logistical support of the Active Army units and activities assigned or attached to the Army; furnish limited administrative and logistical support to additional installations commanded by the chief of an administrative service or technical service of the Department of the Army; provide for administrative and logistical support to units of the Army Air Defense Command; be responsible for organization, administration, training, logistical support, and recruiting of the Reserve components, which include United States Army Reserve, Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC), and, within limitations, National Guard; prepare plans for and conduct operations in internal security, military assistance to civilian authorities during emergencies, ground defense, mobilization, and other specific missions as directed, such as maintaining designated units of the strategic Reserve for rapid deployment; be responsible for joint actions with Air Force and Navy relative to recruiting, induction, operations, training, and matters of mutual interest within Sixth Army area. The program provides \$9,027,000 at 5 installations in the Sixth Army area, for operational and training

facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, real estate and utilities, representing 2.7 percent of the total program.

Other continental United States areas

The Military Academy.—The United States Military Academy, West Point, has the mission of instructing and training the Corps of Cadets, so that each graduate shall have the qualities and attributes essential to his progressive and continuing development throughout a lifetime career as an officer of the Regular Army. The Army's program contains \$5,844,000 for construction of troop housing, medical facilities, and community facilities at the Academy, representing 1.8 percent of the total program.

Armed Forces Special Weapons Project.—The Armed Forces Special Weapons Project is an agency of the Secretary of Defense and of the three military departments. Its mission is to furnish support to the departments in the field of atomic weapons by providing technical, logistical, and training services. The AFSWP responsibilities include national stockpile sites: Sandia Base at Albuquerque, N. Mex., a field command at Sandia Base, and the project headquarters. Construction in the amount of \$273,000 is included in the program, or 0.1 percent at 5 installations to provide maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities.

Tactical installations support.—These facilities provide the close logistical support for tactical defense installations in the continental United States. This element of the program totals \$6,311,000 at various installations, or 1.9 percent of the program, to provide maintenance facilities.

Overseas permanent and general areas

Alaskan area.—The Alaska Command provides the ground and antiaircraft defense and logistic support of military bases in Alaska and operates the Army Arctic Test Center. The program includes \$7,000 for real estate at one location.

Pacific Command area.—The primary missions assigned to the Army in the Pacific are to assist in the ground defense of Korea by providing forces and logistic support thereof, to provide ground forces within the area of responsibility of the commander in chief, Pacific, to train and maintain all elements including Army Reserve components, to utilize resources provided for the conduct of planning required in support of the combined forces in the Pacific, and to provide for and maintain the security and combat readiness of assigned forces. The program for this command totals \$4,662,000 or 1.4 percent of the program for construction in Hawaii and Korea of operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities.

United States Army, Europe.—This element of the program totals \$4,063,000 for continuance of construction of the line of communication in France. The mission of the LOC is to provide logistical support for the combat forces of the United States Army stationed in Germany. The construction is for various installations, will provide operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements. It represents 1.2 percent of the total program.

Section 102

This section includes \$201,121,000 or 60.5 percent of the program for the establishment and development of classified Army installations, worldwide.

Section 103

This section includes \$10 million or 3 percent of the program and will permit construction made necessary by changes in missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements or improved production schedules when deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be detrimental to the interests of our national security.

Section 104

This section authorizes the following: Construction or acquirement by lease or otherwise of 934 units of family housing for occupancy as public quarters overseas pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and construction of 9,916 units of family housing for occupancy as public quarters at 35 locations, and at various Army Air Defense Command stations in accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended.

Sections 105, 106, 107, 108, and 109

These sections provide amendments to Public Law 209 of the 83d Congress, Public Laws 161 and 968 of the 84th Congress, and Public Law 85-241 of the 85th Congress, increasing authorizations granted in these laws at certain installations. These amendments, for the most part, are necessary to defray deficiencies in authorization granted in fiscal years 1954, 1956, 1957, and 1958, brought about basically by the general rise in construction cost indices throughout the world.

Section 106

This section provides an amendment to Public Law 534 of the 83d Congress, increasing authorization granted in that law for the Point Aux Pins Area Ammunition Terminal, Alabama-Mississippi. This amendment is necessary to defray the deficiency in authorization granted in fiscal year 1955, brought about basically by the authorization granted by section 110 hereof requiring the relocation of San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Tex., to the Point Aux Pins area, Alabama-Mississippi.

Section 110

The House will recall that 2 years ago, the Military Construction Act authorized studies relating to ordnance storage areas including the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot in Houston, Tex. Again, this year the committee's attention was directed to this perplexing problem in connection with the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot.

As was pointed out 2 years ago, many of these storage and outloading facilities were established as a consequence of urgent needs brought on by war. Sites were selected on the basis of immediacy of need and sometimes without regard to the ultimate problems which would arise because of their location. It is understandable that the problems of the moment, that is, the quick movement of ammunition, bombs, etc., to our forces was paramount. In some instances these facilities were

established in areas that were already reasonably developed or obviously susceptible to rapid development. In other instances the facility may have been well located at the time of its original selection but the expansion of the country, and particularly the industrial expansion, has placed ammunition storage too close to industrial or habitation areas.

It is for the foregoing reasons that the committee inserted in the bill language requiring that the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot be moved from its present location. The site selected for the relocation is the Point Aux Pins Area in Alabama-Mississippi. The establishment of a facility of this kind in this area was authorized in the 83d Congress by Public Law 534.

Land acquisition

The committee notes that the Army has continued to make most commendable progress in minimizing requests for the acquisition of new lands. Aside from land required for surface-to-air missile air defense in the continental United States, and 487 acres of contaminated acre, purchase of which is necessary to protect the surrounding community, there are only 2 land-acquisition projects included for a total of 63.6 acres to be acquired in fee title at a cost of \$361,000.

TITLE II—NAVY

BRIEF OF AUTHORIZATION

Title II—Navy:

Inside continental United States.....	\$217, 363, 000
Outside continental United States.....	16, 384, 000
Classified.....	75, 301, 000
Emergency construction.....	10, 000, 000
Total.....	319, 048, 000

The Navy would be authorized \$319,048,000 in this bill for new public works, and an increase of \$15,825,000 to compensate for increased costs to construct public works which had been authorized in previous years. This bill would authorize \$18,563,000 less than in fiscal year 1958. It is noted that \$421 million of unused authorization from previous years exists at the beginning of fiscal year 1959. The Navy estimates that, with the execution of its construction program and estimated rescissions, only \$247 million of unused authorization will exist at the beginning of fiscal year 1960.

Modernization

The Navy's program is an incremental part of its continuing long-range program to modernize its Shore Establishment to meet the requirements of new and advancing weapons systems and technology. Included is the replacement of obsolescent and deteriorated facilities. The committee agrees that personnel facilities adequate to provide satisfactory living conditions are an essential part of the program in order that the highest type of officers and enlisted men be motivated toward a career in the Navy.

Long Beach Naval Shipyard

The bill would authorize protection measures against flooding at the Long Beach Naval Shipyard in the amount of \$6 million, subject to the determination by the Secretary of the Navy that action taken

to stop subsidence is effective. This is an increase from the \$500,000 submitted by the Navy for minimum protection against flooding until 1960. This action was taken in the light of a California State law providing for pressurization of the oilfield with salt water. The Secretary of the Navy would be directed to determine that action is effective in preventing further subsidence, otherwise only minimum measures to prevent flooding, in the amount of \$500,000 is to be accomplished.

Harvey Point, Lemoore, and Towers Field

The incremental development of the new naval seaplane facility, Harvey Point, N. C., would continue at \$11,215,000, and the Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif., at \$15,823,000. The Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Fla., would be provided with facilities to accommodate aircraft carriers and escorts in the amount of \$9,892,000. This is the commencement of a program to convert this auxiliary air station into a naval base, which mission it now performs. The bill provides \$17,666,000 as the second increment of the naval air facility, John H. Towers Field to be developed at Andrews Air Force Base. This is a decrease of \$855,000 from that submitted by the Navy for certain common use facilities which should be examined carefully to determine their absolute necessity. When completed, the Navy will transfer to the new facility all aviation activities now at the naval air station at Anacostia. The committee desires that this new activity be named naval air facility, John H. Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base.

As part of the Towers Field project, it had been planned, by additional land acquisition and lengthening and improving its runway, to use Webster Field for practice landings of jet aircraft. Further study by the Navy, however, showed that by developing a dual runway at the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River a much safer operation for these high performance aircraft would result. This dual runway would cost approximately the same as the planned expansion at Webster Field. For these reasons, plus the advantages to be gained by building up at a fully operational station and the fact that no land acquisition would be necessary, it was determined preferable to improve at Patuxent River rather than at Webster Field.

Pacific missile range

The development of the Pacific missile range would be provided in the amount of \$13,841,000. Under an agreement among the services the Navy is responsible for general management, and provides facilities for common use. Pursuant to this agreement, and to enhance Navy missile research, development, and test, facilities would be located at Cooke Air Force Base, the missile facility, Point Arguello, San Nicolas Island, and Naval Air Station, Point Mugu.

Charleston (S. C.) drydock

The committee noted that the Navy has no modern drydocks in the southeastern part of the United States. In view of the increasingly high level of operations in this area, it is considered that the Navy should be authorized to construct a drydock at the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, S. C., in the amount of \$10 million, and this item was added by the committee. It was further determined that there is an urgent need to replace some of the unsatisfactory temporary barracks

at the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Tex., and the committee recommends this additional item in the authorization bill in the amount of \$1,041,000.

Pier and dredging, San Diego.

In view of the phased replacement of the *Essex* class aircraft carriers in the fleet, the committee considers that action should be taken now to provide for berthing for the deeper draft *Forrestal* class aircraft carriers at San Diego. Accordingly, an item for a pier and dredging has been introduced in the amount of \$7 million.

In section 202 the committee considers that the Navy should be authorized an increase in classified facilities to be constructed in the amount of \$10,300,000. This action has been taken after careful examination of the project involved, which is considered to be essential for national defense.

The Navy submission included authorization to construct unnamed public works in the amount of \$25 million. This would provide for requirements not now foreseen, but which could not be deferred to be included in the next military authorization construction act. The committee considers that this provision is justified in principle, but that authorization in the amount of \$10 million is adequate for this purpose.

The bill would authorize the Navy to construct 8,308 units of family housing under Capelhart legislation at locations in the United States and its possessions, and 543 units of family housing to be financed from surplus commodity credit, at 4 locations in foreign countries. The committee considers that the Navy's program of family housing is conservative, providing an average of 55 percent of the requirements of the various stations involved. Criteria for the provision of family housing are: station isolation and inadequate community housing support. Associated with the housing program of the Navy, the committee considered that the Navy should be authorized to acquire Wherry housing projects at the following locations: Whiting Field, Fla., 96 units; and Green Cove Springs, Fla., 392 units. These items were added by the committee. The Navy Department requested authorization to acquire the 385 unit Wherry housing project at Indian Head, Md. The committee recommends that these acquisitions be authorized.

The Navy presented a well justified program, and the committee considers that the authorization requested is the minimum necessary to discharge its mission in the defense of the United States. Such modifications as were made to the Navy submission are intended to improve the program, and they result in a net increase of \$17,988,000 of authorization. It is well integrated to the requirements for support of the Navy's combat forces. Addressed to weapons systems or objectives which have a combat readiness connotation, facilities will support:

Submarine and antisubmarine warfare.....	\$55, 599, 000
Striking power.....	59, 989, 000
Guided missiles.....	28, 840, 000
Training.....	25, 095, 000
Personnel support.....	43, 359, 000
Research and development.....	62, 853, 000
General support of operating forces.....	33, 313, 000
Emergency construction.....	10, 000, 000
Grand total.....	319, 048, 000

The committee examined the program submitted by the Navy thoroughly, and interrogated Navy representatives in detail. With the modifications outlined above it is approved by the committee, and consists of 11 classes of facilities as follows:

1. Shipyard facilities, \$20,506,000

Shipyard facilities are required for protection of existing facilities and to support operations of new type submarines and large, modern aircraft carriers

This class of facilities is composed of 7 line items at 4 Continental activities and 1 line item at 1 overseas location. A major project consists of two line items at New London, Conn., one of which will augment the berthing facilities at this submarine base for the newer nuclear submarines, and another designed to improve communications and thus render more efficient and economical the control of submarines by the Atlantic Submarine Type Commander. A project for the temporary oceanographic research facility at Cape May, N. J., will guard that installation against erosion of the beach opposite it until a permanent station in a more protected location can be established.

A dredging project at the San Francisco Naval Shipyard will permit the access by *Forrestal* class carriers to dry dock No. IV at times other than high tide, and will, in addition, provide needed berthing space alongside certain of the piers for ships of this class. It will permit homeporting of one of these large carriers at a west coast operating base for the first time. A project for the Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, T. H., will provide a storage building for the storage and ready issue of compressed high energy fuel in support of submarines and submarine and antisubmarine weapons.

2. Fleet base facilities, \$4,255,000

Fleet base facilities include 2 projects required at 2 east coast stations in support of uniformed personnel and the fleet.

The first of these two projects is at the United States Naval Station, Newport, R. I. It consists of two line items at an estimated cost of \$1,709,000. The first item is for provision of a messhall at a cost of \$1,048,000. It will replace the present deteriorated wood structure which was built in World War II as a temporary facility. The second item is for construction of an enlisted men's service club, at a cost of \$661,000, to accommodate fleet and shore-based personnel on liberty in this community where recreation and amusement facilities are limited for the large number of enlisted men involved.

The second project is at the United States Naval Base, Norfolk, Va., for dredging an area in the Elizabeth River approaches to the naval base piers at an estimated cost of \$2,546,000. It is required to minimize danger of grounding or collision when docking or undocking large carriers of the Navy's striking force.

3. Aviation facilities, \$118,390,000

The aviation shore activities are required for training naval aviators, for supporting the operating forces, including the Marine Corps, and for research and development in the aeronautical field. The projects in the bill under the sponsorship of the Bureau of Aeronautics are designed to enable the Naval Aeronautical Shore Establishment to attain its mission and to improve safety of air operations.

Aviation facilities comprise approximately 40 percent of the Navy's program dollarwise. This class includes 128 line items at 26 air stations.

The aviation facilities are composed of five groups of air stations. The first group consists of 17 line items at 3 naval air training stations. These items provide for the third increment in the development of the air training stations at Meridian, Miss.; for the construction of an outlying field for the Auxiliary Air Station at Whiting Field, Fla.; and the construction of a barracks for the maintenance crews at NAS, Kingsville, Tex.

The second group, the fleet support air stations, consists of 50 line items at 11 stations. Included are second increments and additional items for development of the master jet field at Lemoore, Calif.; second increment and additional items for a seaplane facility at Harvey Point, N. C.; and line items including land acquisition for the development of Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Fla. Projects are included for liquid oxygen facilities at 4 stations, optical landing system installations at 3 stations, and a jet engine maintenance shop at NAS, Cecil Field, Fla.

The third group consists of 6 line items at 4 Marine Corps Air Stations and Air Facilities. These items include extension of the runway and land acquisition at Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, S. C.; a radar air traffic control center and supply storehouse at Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C.; aircraft parking aprons for helicopters at Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, N. C., and Santa Ana, Calif.; and fuel storage facilities at Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, N. C.

The fourth group of 2 special-purpose air stations includes 38 line items. Projects for the first of these stations will develop the Naval Air Facility, John H. Towers Field at Andrews Air Force Base, and provide nearby facility for landing practice at NAS Patuxent, Md. This will permit flight operations to be transferred from the Naval Air Station, Anacostia. Projects for the second station continue development of the Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, Calif., and include 3 line items for San Nicolas Island and 5 items for the extension of the Pacific Missile Range, operating from the former Army Camp Cooke.

The final aviation facilities group are 17 line items at 6 existing air stations. The program includes a third increment for facilities at Roosevelt Roads where guided-missile training for the Navy operating forces of the Atlantic Fleet is to be carried on. Another major item in the group provides for the extension of a runway at Naval Air Station, Guam, in order to safely handle jet-type aircraft. The other projects will continue the development of strategic overseas naval air facilities.

4. Supply facilities, \$5,544,000

The Bureau of Supplies and Accounts' shore facilities provide worldwide supply support to the fleet. Supply centers and depots replenish warships directly and through fleet issue ships and tankers, which, in turn, deliver underway to the fleet wherever deployed at sea. Navy materials are furnished naval installations such as shipyards and bases, air stations, training centers, etc. The procurement, inventory, and financial control of over a million items of repair parts and consumable supplies is performed with business machines located at the supply control offices and depots.

This group of projects will provide a rehabilitated and improved steam system for receiving, storing, and issuing petroleum products to the fleet at the Naval Supply Depot, Newport, R. I., the first increment of an underground petroleum storage facility for the Pacific fleet at the Naval Supply Depot, Guam, and the building alterations to install electronic data processing machines for stock and inventory control at the Naval Supply Centers, Oakland, Calif., and Norfolk, Va.

5. Marine Corps facilities \$6,495,000.

The mission and purpose of the Marine Corps shore facilities are to support the Marine Corps combat forces in order that they may be maintained in readiness to engage promptly and effectively in combat operations with continuing maximum efforts devoted to cumulative improvements in readiness at all levels.

The Marine Corps is subject to call on short notice to deploy its forces, ranging in size from a few men to a division, to any part of the world for guard duty, to quell a disturbance, or to participate in full-scale war. Consequently, the marines must be highly trained in amphibious and other means of warfare, and competently led. Constant training is necessary to obtain and retain proficiency. This group of projects consists of 11 line items at 6 continental Marine Corps activities. Facilities will be provided for maintenance of Marine equipment and support and training of personnel.

6. Ordnance facilities, \$18,177,000

The objective of the military construction program of the Bureau of Ordnance is to provide and keep modern facilities ashore for effective support of the fleet and for the conduct of research, design, development, limited production, test, and evaluation materials, components, assemblies, and systems principally in the fields of rockets, missiles, and underwater ordnance.

This program contains 13 line items at 12 continental locations. Seven of these items totaling \$2,661,000 or 14.6 percent of the ordnance program are at activities doing important research and development work on missiles; 3, totaling \$3,356,000 or 18.5 percent of the program, are guided-missile support facilities, 2, totaling \$1,774,000 or 9.7 percent of the program, are antisubmarine weapon support facilities; 1, for \$86,000 or one-half of 1 percent of the program, is for support of conventional weapons; and 1 classified project for \$10,300,000 or 56.7 percent of the ordnance program.

7. Service school facilities, \$26,717,000

The Bureau of Naval Personnel is responsible for the procurement, distribution, training, education, discharge, promotion, and retirement of Navy personnel, and for the processing and maintenance of records of Navy personnel.

This group of projects consists of 8 line items at 8 locations. They provide for training and support facilities. Included is the second increment for extension of Bancroft Hall at the Naval Academy to alleviate the longstanding problem of the crowded living conditions of the midshipmen. Also included are items to provide facilities to train personnel in the fields of nuclear power propulsion and guided missiles.

8. Medical facilities, \$8,503,000

There are two line items at the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md. These items will provide for replacement of inadequate or temporary medical facilities, and new facilities for radiation exposure evaluation.

9. Communication facilities, \$40,572,000

The mission of naval communications is to provide required reliable, secure, rapid communications primarily for control of the operating forces, and secondarily to facilitate the administration of the Naval Establishment.

In the group of projects for communications facilities are one continental project and three overseas projects.

The continental project at the United States Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine, will provide very low frequency transmitting facilities to support the operation of submarine forces, surface forces, and special communication functions in the North Atlantic and Arctic areas.

The program for communications facilities at overseas activities consists of three projects which will provide facilities to house radio receiving equipment which will permit vital area coverage for a special ship-shore communications net. Facilities will be installed at Asmara, Eritrea; Londonderry, North Ireland; and Port Lyautey, Morocco. These projects are essential to operations under the control of the Navy in the North Atlantic and Mediterranean areas.

10. Office of Naval Research, \$60,192,000

Public works sponsored by the Office of Naval Research are for the purpose of providing adequate facilities for conducting scientific research and development in the fields of nuclear physics and radio astronomy.

There are only 2 line items at 2 continental locations in this group. The first line item for \$192,000 will provide for an additional floor in the 3-story laboratory building at the Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia, to provide needed space to further research in the nuclear field. The other line item will provide facilities for the Naval Radio Research Laboratory at Sugar Grove, W. Va.

11. Yards and Docks facilities, \$890,000

The shore activities of the Bureau of Yards and Docks (a) receive, store, and issue construction materials and packaged overseas base utility and public-works systems; (b) operate and maintain facilities at major naval bases; and (c) supervise construction of the Navy and, if required, the Air Force public-works program.

This group of two line items will provide (a) an augmented water-supply system, alleviating a critical water shortage and a substandard fire-protection system, and (b) an additional facility to correct an inadequate electric power system. Both items are for the Atlantic Fleet's Naval Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

The committee also approved 17 amendments to prior authorizations of public works. It considered that the various factors contributing to higher costs in today's construction market warrant the requested increases in authorization. The amount approved totals \$15,825,000.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

BRIEF OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Inside continental United States (sec. 301).....	\$536, 218, 000
Outside continental United States (sec. 301).....	123, 654, 000
Missiles (sec. 302).....	287, 500, 000
Unforeseen construction (sec. 303).....	10, 000, 000
Subtotal.....	957, 372, 000
Air Force Academy (sec. 309).....	4, 372, 000
Total new authorization.....	961, 744, 000
Increased authorization for prior years' projects (secs. 305, 306, 307, 308).....	13, 411, 000
Total amount of Air Force authorization.....	975, 155, 000

The Air Force would be authorized \$957,372,000 in this bill to provide for the construction of new facilities at 160 major installations, of which 109 are inside the United States and 51 are outside the United States. The bill also provides facilities at a number of installations and sites, including operational sites for strategic, defense, and tactical missiles, off-base navigational aids, aircraft control and warning system sites, and facilities at classified locations. In addition, the bill provides an increased authorization in the amount of \$4,372,000 for the Air Force Academy by amending Public Law 325, 83d Congress. Finally, the bill provides an increase of \$13,411,000 in authorization in prior years' laws to cover the increased costs of certain approved projects. The Air Force will have a major force structure of 117 wings by the end of fiscal year 1958. The fiscal year 1959 military construction program of the Air Force includes the minimum facilities to provide an operational capability to the forces planned at end fiscal year 1961.

A breakout of the Air Force authorization request is contained in the following table:

Command	Authorized amount	Percent of total
Inside the United States:	<i>Thousands</i>	
Air Defense Command.....	\$66, 738	6.9
Air Materiel Command.....	34, 595	3.6
Air Research and Development Command.....	28, 270	3.0
Air Training Command.....	23, 090	2.4
Continental Air Command.....	13, 566	1.4
Headquarters Command.....	18, 937	2.0
Military Air Transport Service.....	7, 276	.7
Strategic Air Command.....	164, 298	17.1
Tactical Air Command.....	15, 819	1.6
Special facilities.....	563	.1
Aircraft control and warning system.....	163, 066	17.0
Total, inside the United States.....	536, 218	55.8
Outside the United States:		
Air Materiel Command.....	696	.1
Alaskan Air Command.....	26, 416	2.7
Caribbean Air Command.....	1, 540	.2
Military Air Transport Service.....	5, 347	.5
Pacific Air Forces.....	16, 671	1.7
Strategic Air Command.....	23, 582	2.4
United States Air Forces in Europe.....	19, 952	2.1
Aircraft control and warning system.....	29, 135	3.0
Special facilities.....	315	.1
Total, outside the United States.....	123, 654	12.8
Sec. 302: Ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles.....	287, 500	29.9
Sec. 303: Unforeseen construction.....	10, 000	1.0
Sec. 309: Air Force Academy.....	4, 372	.5
Total new authorization.....	961, 744	100.0

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

The mission of this command is to provide for the air defense of the continental United States.

This program contains a request for \$66,738,000 and provides operating facilities at 17 locations.

Included within the total of \$66,738,000 is an amount of \$30,881,000 to provide facilities in support of Strategic Air Command heavy bomber and/or tanker squadrons at 9 locations, an amount of \$842,000 to provide support facilities for SAGE at 2 locations, and an amount of \$520,000 to provide support facilities for Military Air Transport Command at 1 location.

The remainder of the Air Defense Command program, totaling \$34,495,000, provides facilities required to support the basic mission.

Facilities in support of the Air Defense Command are also included in the Air Research and Development Command for \$762,000, the Air Training Command for \$2,191,000, the Military Air Transport Service for \$222,000, the Strategic Air Command for \$6,652,000, and the Tactical Air Command for \$836,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

The mission of the Air Materiel Command is to (1) provide adequate and efficient systems of procurement, production, maintenance, and supply for the United States Air Force; (2) provide general overall logistical support for all activities and agencies for the United States Air Force; (3) train specialized units for accomplishment of specified logistics functions in overseas areas and theaters; and (4) train individuals requiring a long training lead time to fill requirements of air-depot-type units scheduled for activation and to fill replacement requirements. This program contains a request for \$34,595,000 for Air Materiel Command and provides facilities at 12 locations.

Included within the Air Materiel Command total program are facilities for Air Materiel Command depot supply and maintenance requirements totaling \$8,142,000. The SAC mission at 3 AMC locations requires a total of \$8,788,000, and there are Research and Development requirements at 1 AMC location estimated to cost \$6,500,000. The remainder of the program is composed of items to satisfy the basic Air Materiel mission requirement.

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

The mission of the Air Research and Development Command is to attain and maintain qualitative superiority by the following procedures: (1) Conduct or supervise scientific and technical studies required for the accomplishment of Air Force missions; (2) seek new basic knowledge from which improved aeronautical equipment, material, weapons, and techniques can be developed; (3) undertake the development and recommend the adoption of appropriate new and improved devices and systems for the conduct and support of air warfare, including aircraft, missiles, weapons, techniques, and procedures applicable to Air Force purposes; (4) perform employment and suitability testing of aircraft, guided missiles, navigational aids, components, and material. This program contains a request for \$28,270,000

for Research and Development Command and provides facilities at 10 locations, including 3 auxiliary sites.

Included within the Air Research and Development Command total program are facilities for research, development, and testing totaling \$5,971,000; Air Defense fighter-interceptor squadron at 1 base totaling \$481,000; Air Defense missile training at 2 bases totaling \$531,000; and a SAC mission at 1 location totaling \$3,116,000. The remainder of the program is composed of items to support the basic ARDC mission requirement. Facilities in support of the Air Research and Development Command are also included in the Air Materiel Command program in the amount of \$6,500,000.

SCHOOL OF AVIATION MEDICINE

Under this heading, authority has been provided in the amount of \$12 million for facilities for the School of Aviation Medicine. This item is dealt with in more detail later in the report.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

The mission of the Air Training Command is to provide flying training leading to an aeronautical rating; aircrew training; basic and advanced technical training leading to an Air Force specialty; basic military training; mobile training, and such other training as may be directed by the Chief of Staff, USAF. This program contains a request for \$23,090,000 for Air Training Command and provides facilities at 18 locations.

Included in the above total is \$16,056,000 which provides facilities for the basic Air Training Command mission. Facilities are also included to accommodate SAC missions totaling \$4,843,000, and an Air Defense Command mission for \$2,191,000.

CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

The mission of the Continental Air Command is to discharge within the continental United States field responsibilities of the USAF Chief of Staff with respect to Reserve forces for the Air Force that are assigned to Continental Air Command, including supervision and inspection of Air National Guard; domestic emergencies, and miscellaneous administrative functions; and, in event of war or other emergency, to mobilize units and/or individuals of the Air Force Reserve that are assigned to the Continental Air Command. This program contains a request for \$13,566,000 and provides facilities at 3 locations.

Included in the program is \$1,805,000 for facilities at the School of Aviation Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base; the second increment of phased operational facilities to support a SAC mission at Clinton County Air Force Base totaling \$11,589,000 and \$172,000 for a heating plant at Dobbins Air Force Base.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

The mission of the Headquarters Command is to provide proficiency flying, training, housekeeping and support of United States Air Force personnel in the Washington area. Specifically, this command provides administrative and logistic support for the USAF

Headquarters Squadron, for those Air Force units stationed within the Washington area where inherent organizational structure does not permit other support, and such other missions as may be directed by the Chief of Staff, USAF. This program contains a request for \$18,937,000 for Headquarters Command and provides facilities at one location, primarily to allow the moving of combat readiness training (CRT) activities from Bolling Air Force Base to Andrews Air Force Base.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

The mission of the Military Air Transport Service is to provide: (1) airlift required in support of approved joint war plans; (2) scheduled airlift for the Department of Defense within the continental United States, between the continental United States and overseas areas, and between and within overseas areas as directed by higher authority; (3) worldwide air transport, air weather, airways and air communications and air rescue service systems; (4) flight service within the Zone of Interior; (5) organization and training of air resupply and communications services; (6) supervision and control and maintenance of primary facilities required for performing its assigned mission; and (7) theater jurisdiction in overseas areas where MATS units are stationed but which are outside the jurisdiction of any theater commander. This program contains a request for \$7,276,000 for Military Air Transport Service and provides facilities at 4 locations.

Included within the Military Air Transport Service total program are facilities for Air Defense missions costing \$222,000; facilities for United States Navy Air Transport squadrons at 1 base, costing \$626,000; facilities for SAC tanker missions at 2 bases, costing \$4,668,000. The remainder of the program is composed of items to satisfy the basic MATS mission requirements.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

The mission of this command is to organize, train, equip, administer, and prepare a force capable of conducting strategic air operations in accordance with directives and policies issued by Headquarters, United States Air Force. This program contains a request for \$164,-298,000 for the Strategic Air Command and provides facilities at 40 locations.

Included in the Strategic Air Command program is an amount of \$70,929,000 to provide alert capability at 15 heavy-bomber bases, and 15 medium-bomber bases. An amount of \$22,380,000 is requested to provide additional facilities required at 10 heavy bomber home bases. Of this amount, approximately \$3,400,000 is requested for facilities necessary to convert Beale Air Force Base to a heavy bomber home base and approximately \$8 million is included for airfield pavement strengthening and replacement. An amount of \$4,888,000 is requested to provide additional facilities necessary at 6 heavy bomber dispersal bases included in prior programs. An amount of \$15,552,000 contained in this program provides for construction of the second increment of facilities at Richard I. Bong Air Force Base. In addition, \$11,417,000 is provided for the relocation of a Strategic

Air Command tanker squadron on a joint-utilization basis with the Navy at Brunswick Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine.

An amount of \$148,000 will provide facilities to support SAGE. An amount of \$3,799,000 is requested to accommodate redeployment of air defense fighter missions at 3 bases. In addition, \$2,853,000 is included to provide required facilities for air defense missions at 7 Strategic Air Command bases.

The remainder of the Strategic Air Command program, amounting to \$32,332,000 will provide for items required to support the basic mission throughout the entire command.

In addition to the program specified in the foregoing paragraphs, facilities to support the Strategic Air Command are included within other major Zone of Interior commands as follows:

Air Defense Command.....	\$28,749,000
Air Materiel Command.....	15,288,000
Air Research and Development Command.....	3,116,000
Air Training Command.....	4,843,000
Continental Air Command.....	11,589,000
Military Air Transport Service.....	4,668,000
Tactical Air Command.....	5,677,000

This authorization requested within other commands amounts to a total of \$73,930,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

The mission of the Tactical Air Command is to organize, equip, train, and administer the forces assigned or attached, to participate in tactical air operations, including light and tactical bombardment, day fighter, fighter bomber, tactical missiles, troop carrier, reconnaissance and support units; maintenance of liaison with Continental Army Command and the determination of the amount of Tactical Air Command resources to allocate for the training of Air Force and Army personnel and units in air-ground operations; and maintenance of a capability and development of plans for the deployment of mobile atomic strike forces for use in tactical air operations in any area of the world independent of or in concert with other land, air, naval and/or amphibious forces. This program contains a request for \$15,819,000 for Tactical Air Command and provides facilities at 7 locations.

Included within the Tactical Air Command total program are facilities for operational and base support items totaling \$7,546,000. The balance of the program provides facilities for a mission at 2 locations for \$5,677,000 and an ADC mission at 1 base costing \$2,596,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES (ZONE OF INTERIOR)

This section contains special facilities of an operational nature amounting to \$563,000. These facilities will support a classified mission and they are to be constructed at three locations. Two locations have not been firmly selected. The third location, although selected, is classified.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM, ZONE OF INTERIOR

The aircraft control and warning system is the ground environment portion of the air defense system. The aircraft control and warning

function is to detect and identify all airborne objects, evaluate the threat, commit and control weapons such as manned interceptors and missiles for the destruction of enemy targets. The Zone of Interior aircraft control and warning portion of this program totals \$163,066,000. This section consists of the following programs:

The first program will provide \$100 million for the initiation of an extensive radar improvement program. This program will provide for electric power, utilities, radar towers and real estate to support new and highly improved radar equipment. This will improve identification capabilities as well as decreasing enemy capabilities to effectively utilize electronic countermeasures against our radars. The construction involved in this type of radar improvement consists primarily of the procurement and installation of enclosed radar towers and the provision of large quantities of electric power for operation of the newer high-powered radars.

The next program will provide \$27,029,000 to construct SAGE direction centers. This request will provide for five direction centers as an increment toward the completion of the total SAGE program.

The next program provides \$1,456,000 for SAGE support type facilities. Specifically, this item will construct operational type facilities at four locations, maintenance facilities at one location, supply facilities at 3 locations, administrative facilities at 4 locations, personnel facilities at 2 locations and utilities at 2 locations.

The next program provides \$4,232,000 for SAGE communications facilities. This will furnish communications receivers at 19 locations, communications transmitters at 21 locations, and addition to the aircraft control and warning operational buildings at 21 locations.

The next program provides \$13,466,000 for various facilities at aircraft control and warning sites throughout the Zone of Interior. This program will construct 5 new manned aircraft control and warning sites and 8 new unmanned automatic radar stations (gap fillers). In addition, it provides various support and personnel facilities for existing sites inside the United States.

The last program provides \$16,883,000 for construction of the Air Force portion of a Joint-Army-Air Force operated missile defense center system in the United States. Present plans call for a number of centers in this system, also known as the Missile Master, with the Air Force being the host at some centers and the Army being the host at others. This request will provide technical and support facilities at the Air Force locations and technical facilities only at the Army locations.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND (OVERSEAS)

The mission of the Air Materiel Command is to provide adequate and efficient systems of procurement, production, maintenance and supply for the United States Air Force; provide general overall logistical support for all activities and agencies of the United States Air Force; train specialized units for the accomplishment of specified logistics functions in overseas areas and theaters; and, train individuals to fill requirements of newly activated air depot units and replacement requests.

This program contains a request for \$696,000 and provides facilities at one location.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

The mission of the Alaskan Air Command is to organize and conduct the air defense of Alaska and provide early warning to the United States and Canada. This command supports the Strategic Air Command, Military Air Transport Service, COMALSEAFRON, the United States Army, and the northwest route to the Orient. This program contains a request for \$26,416,000 for the Alaskan Air Command and provides facilities at 3 bases and 7 various locations.

Included within the Alaskan Air Command total program are facilities at 6 locations totaling \$12,503,000 for ground control intercept radar stations related to the western extension of DEW line and the air defense system; Air Force security service mission at 2 locations totaling \$13,193,000; the remainder of the program is composed of items totaling \$720,000 to satisfy the basic mission requirement.

CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

The mission of the Caribbean Air Command is to provide supervision, guidance, and administrative control of the USAF missions in Latin America; provide supervision, guidance, and administrative control of the Air Force phase of the mutual defense assistance program (MDAP) for Latin American countries; conduct a USAF school for Latin America; provide logistic support for air attachés and USAF missions in Latin America; provide airlift within Latin America for the inter-American geodetic survey team and provide administrative control of the United States Air Force Section, Joint Brazil-United States Military Commission. This program contains a request for \$1,540,000 for the Caribbean Air Command and provides facilities at one base.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE (OVERSEAS)

The mission of the Military Air Transport Service is to provide aircraft required in support of approved joint war plans; scheduled airlifts for the Department of Defense between the continental United States and overseas areas; between and within overseas areas; worldwide air transport; air weather; airways and air communications; air rescue service systems; and organization and training of air resupply and communications service and all elements thereof. This program contains a request for \$5,347,000 for the Military Air Transport Service and provides facilities at three various locations.

Included within the Military Air Transport Service program are facilities for the Military Air Transport Service to satisfy the basic mission requirements totaling \$4,507,000 at 3 locations, and facilities in support of the SAC mission totaling \$840,000 at these same 3 locations.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

The mission of the Pacific Air Forces is to conduct tactical air operations, the air defense of Japan, Ryukyus, Mariannas, Hawaii, and the United States installations in the Philippines; provide air transportation for combat troops, other personnel and supplies in the Pacific and Far East areas; and, to provide logistic support to PACAF and SAC forces. This program contains a request for \$16,671,000

for the Pacific Air Forces and provides facilities at 2 bases and 11 various locations.

The Pacific Air Forces program includes facilities for a classified operational mission at 2 locations totaling \$7,050,000, a mobile radio squadron at 1 classified location for \$857,000 and a fighter mission at 1 location for \$203,000; 1 project for \$116,000 in support of the SAC mission; \$839,000 in support of overseas Military Air Transport Service at 1 location. The remainder of the program totaling \$7,606,000 is composed of items to meet the basic Pacific Air Forces mission requirements.

Included in the Strategic Air Command are facilities for \$343,000 at Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, in support of fighter interceptor aircraft at this base.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND (OVERSEAS)

The mission of this command is to organize, train, equip, administer, and prepare a force capable of conducting strategic air operations in accordance with directives and policies issued by Headquarters, United States Air Force. This program contains a request for \$23,582,000 for the Strategic Air Command and provides facilities at 2 Air Force bases and 8 various locations located in Great Britain, Greenland, Guam, Morocco, Newfoundland, Puerto Rico, and Spain.

Included within Strategic Air Command program are facilities to support MATS operations totaling \$342,000 and at 3 locations projects for support of tenant fighter interceptor aircraft totaling \$1,073,000, broken down as follows: \$343,000 Pacific Air Forces and \$221,000 Air Defense Command overseas. The remainder of the program is composed of items to satisfy the basic SAC mission requirements. In addition to the program outlined above, facilities to support the Strategic Air Command are included within the MATS overseas program in the amount of \$840,000 and Pacific Air Forces in the amount of \$116,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

The mission of the United States Air Forces in Europe is to support the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe; United States Commander in Chief, Europe, and the other component commanders under USCINCEUR in their assigned missions; to fulfill responsibilities assigned the Joint Chiefs of Staff in areas not included in either the NATO or USCINCEUR's area of responsibility, and to support commanders operating directly under the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This program contains a request for \$19,952,000 for United States Air Forces in Europe and provides facilities at 30 locations.

Included in the program are facilities to support aircraft control and warning activities at 4 locations totaling \$672,000; mobile radio squadrons at 3 locations totaling \$5,101,000; 6 locations for ammunition storage and rocket assembly totaling \$2,298,000; fighter aircraft at 6 locations totaling \$3,870,000; fighter bomber aircraft at 5 bases totaling \$544,000; troop carrier aircraft at one location totaling \$964,000; tactical reconnaissance aircraft at 1 location totaling \$232,000; facilities at 3 bases totaling \$2,822,000 in support of tactical guided missiles; and, medical facilities at 2 locations totaling \$682,000; also

included are 250 family units at 2 locations. The remainder of the program, totaling \$2,767,000, is composed of items to satisfy the basic USAFE mission requirement.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM OVERSEAS

The overseas aircraft control and warning portion of this program totals \$29,135,000. Of this, \$25,000,000 is for the eastward extension of the DEW line and \$4,135,000 is for electric power, heated auto storage, dormitories, and utilities at various aircraft control and warning sites.

SPECIAL FACILITIES—VARIOUS LOCATIONS

This section covers special facilities at various overseas locations totaling \$315,000 for 4 classified projects at 4 locations.

The requirement for each facility is dictated by the progress of technical developments pertinent to the accomplishment of the mission.

RATIO OF CONSTRUCTION IN OVERSEAS AREAS

Of the \$123 million shown for outside the United States, \$31,189,000 are in United States Territories and possessions, and \$48,881,000 are for projects on the North American Continent which directly contribute to continental defense. This leaves only \$43,584,000 or less than 5 percent of the total program for projects in what we would term "foreign" countries. This annually decreasing ratio of foreign construction in the Air Force program is in line with the progress being made to improve the intercontinental strike capability of the Strategic Air Command and the increased contributions of their self-defense by our allies.

Category distribution of Air Force fiscal year 1959 military construction authorization

	Total (thousands)	Percent of total
Operational and training.....	\$238, 079	24.9
Maintenance and production.....	63, 680	6.6
Research, development, and test.....	12, 471	1.3
Supply.....	37, 347	3.9
Hospital and medical.....	18, 593	1.9
Administrative.....	4, 495	.5
Housing and community.....	62, 007	6.5
Utilities and ground improvements.....	78, 486	8.2
Real estate.....	1, 341	.1
Real estate improvements.....	685	.1
Various ¹	440, 188	46.0
Total.....	957, 372	100.0

¹ This item consists principally of ballistics, strategic, and defense missile facilities; radar improvements and the new radar-gap filler sites; DEW line; authorization for the School of Aviation Medicine at Brooks AFB, Tex., and authorization for unforeseen construction.

BALLISTIC, STRATEGIC, AND DEFENSE MISSILES

The Air Force program provides a total of \$287,500,000 for facilities for ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles. This amount includes authorization for construction of operational Atlas facilities at one additional location, not yet firmly selected, and support facilities for

both the previously programed and the new Atlas site. It also includes authorization for the construction of hardened facilities for the Titan ICBM. In addition, the fiscal year 1959 program provides for construction of operational facilities for the intermediate range ballistic missile at overseas locations and for test and training facilities for both the ICBM and the IRBM at Cooke Air Force Base. This package also contains facilities for the Hounddog and the Quail air-to-surface missiles carried by Strategic Air Command bombers to provide them with greater penetration capability. The package also provides facilities in the United States for the Goose which is a surface-to-surface air-breathing missile with an intercontinental range. Facilities for the Goose missile also were authorized in fiscal year 1958. The Air Force program also contains authorization for facilities for the Bomarc missile. Construction of facilities for this missile was initiated in the fiscal year 1958 construction program at 4 locations. This fiscal year 1959 request will add facilities at 10 additional locations.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Section 309 of the bill amends Public Law 325, 83d Congress, to provide for an increase of \$4,372,000 in construction authorized for the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs, Colo. The items to be constructed with this increased authorization consist of roadway facilities, erosion control and landscaping, and diesel fuel storage.

At the present time construction of the permanent Academy is 69 percent complete. Of the \$122,234,548 under contract \$78,049,000 worth of work is in place. The total amount authorized and funded to date is approximately \$135.5 million.

REAL ESTATE

The Air Force seeks authorization in this program to acquire various identified interests in 4,491 acres of land, all inside the United States, at a cost of \$1,341,000. These land interests are required primarily to extend runways at existing installations; to develop facilities for the guided missile programs; to establish clearances for flight safety in runway approach zones; to provide safety clearances for weapons storage facilities; and to expand operational and support facilities. In addition, certain real-estate interests, not yet firmly delineated, will be acquired under the authorizations requested for the missile programs. No withdrawals from the public domain are requested. The following table summarizes the identified land items in the program:

Land interests in Air Force, fiscal year 1959 military construction authorization

Interest	Acres	Cost
Fee purchase.....	1,555	\$1,163,000
Restrictive easement.....	1,680	8,000
Clearance easement.....	1,017	74,000
Right-of-way easement.....	239	96,000
Total.....	4,491	1,341,000

DISPOSAL OF REAL PROPERTY

The Air Force is continuing its policy to acquire only that land needed for present and immediately foreseeable operations and to relinquish lands for which continued requirements are not foreseen. During calendar year 1957, the Air Force issued directives to dispose of 1,165,060 acres of land and 253,333 square feet of space in buildings in the United States. A summation of disposals by type follows. (1) Land returned to public domain, 29,606 acres. (2) Government-owned land, with improvements, 2,262 acres. This land will be returned to the tax rolls, resulting in increased revenue for the communities concerned. Further, the sale of this property results in certain moneys being deposited in the Treasury of the United States. (3) Leases canceled, 17,389 acres of land, and 253,333 square feet of space in buildings. Cancellation of these leases results in reductions of \$689,152 per annum in lease costs, as well as considerable reductions in annual maintenance costs. (4) Lesser interests, such as easements and permits, which were canceled or otherwise disposed of totaled 1,115,803 acres.

FAMILY HOUSING

Family housing for Air Force personnel remains one of the most important personnel facilities and bears directly upon the operating effectiveness, morale, reenlistment rates, and the cost of training replacements in terms of time, manpower, and money.

The Air Force is making steady progress in providing housing for officers and upper grade airmen, particularly by means of the title VIII program of the National Housing Act. Of the current active title VIII program for 52,622 units, as of May 1, 1958, 2,706 units at 5 locations have been completed, 18,232 units are under construction at 27 locations. The balance of 31,684 units are in various steps of planning, approval, and design.

There are certain features of the Air Force family housing program which differ somewhat from the practices in previous years. First, in compliance with the intent of Congress as indicated in section 401 of Public Law 85-241, August 20, 1957 (fiscal year 1958 Military Construction Authorization Act), there are no new dollar authorizations requested for the housing projects which are to be constructed with appropriated funds. Instead, unused family housing dollar authorizations from prior years will be utilized to construct the family housing projects which are specifically requested in title III of this bill. This practice is followed, of course by the Army and Navy also.

Second, the Air Force is taking action to rehabilitate those public quarters determined to be and declared inadequate in accordance with section 407 of Public Law 85-241. Under the law, such quarters must be improved to standards of adequacy to qualify as public quarters with forfeiture of quarters allowances, or be taken out of the housing inventory or otherwise disposed of by July 1, 1960. The first increment of this program is scheduled to be financed in fiscal year 1959.

Third, authorizations to construct housing projects specifically by locations and numbers of units under the title VIII and surplus commodity programs and to acquire Wherry housing projects are requested in this bill in compliance with section 406 of Public Law 85-241.

UNFORESEEN CONSTRUCTION

Ten million dollars of authorization is requested in this bill for construction of unforeseen projects, without identification to specific construction items or locations. This authorization will provide the Secretary of the Air Force authority to construct urgently required facilities for which requirements are not now known or firm but which must be initiated prior to the next military construction authorization act.

Changing international conditions and operational concepts, changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, improved production schedules, and new or unforeseen research and development requirements often create new and additional facility requirements on which construction must be initiated promptly and provided in short periods of time in order that the weapons and systems may be effectively utilized at the earliest possible dates or by specified requirement dates. With present rapidly advancing enemy capabilities and United States technology, it is imperative that construction be provided where needed to support the introduction of new developments in weapons systems and operational concepts. For the same reason, it is not always possible to accurately and fully foresee all such requirements in time to include them in the normal annual military construction program which would eliminate the need for emergency actions to produce the facilities by the time required.

Public Law 968, 84th Congress (fiscal year 1957 program) provided the Secretary of the Air Force with \$50 million of this type of emergency construction authorization. Approximately \$44 million of this authorization has been utilized and the Armed Services Committee of the Congress so notified, and an additional \$4 million is in various stages of processing for initiation of construction in fiscal year 1958. In view of recent developments and the continuing acceleration of defense programs, it is anticipated that the balance of the Air Force available authorization for unforeseen construction will be fully utilized prior to the end of fiscal year 1958.

Based upon the level of actual and planned use of unforeseen construction authorization in fiscal year 1958, a minimum of \$10 million in new authorization is required in fiscal year 1958 to allow the Air Force to proceed with urgent construction which must be initiated prior to the time that the regular fiscal year 1960 military construction program will be enacted into law.

TITLE IV

This title would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish or develop installations or facilities for advanced research projects. In connection with the exercise of this authority, the Secretary is authorized to acquire or construct facilities, acquire land, prepare sites, and engage in other similar activities. The title authorizes \$50 million for these purposes. The committee inserted language which requires the Secretary of Defense to report to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives semiannually with respect to the exercise of this authority.

ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY

On February 7, 1958, the Secretary of Defense issued a directive which gives to the Advanced Research Projects Agency the responsibility for planning and directing advanced research projects involving space science and technology, ballistic missile defense and other advanced research and development as assigned from time to time by the Secretary.

The Advanced Research Projects Agency was organized to provide for the Department of Defense expedited and forward-looking research programs which in the past have been retarded by the necessity for a formal military requirement. The organization of the Agency is in recognition of the importance of pushing advanced research which may have military applications even before it is known whether the results will be fruitful and how any results achieved may be used.

By utilizing existing facilities of the military departments, other Government agencies, universities, and industry, it is believed that the Advanced Research Projects Agency can effectively carry out its responsibilities with a small staff of about 20 staff assistants, together with the necessary clerical and stenographic support. In addition, arrangements have been made for the Institute for Defense Analyses to provide scientific and technical assistance with about 25 scientists. In the future it is anticipated additional contracts with universities and industry for studies and management-type activities.

The committee was informed that it is not intended to expand to a large organization that will require extensive laboratories, although there probably will be some modifications to existing facility complexes to keep from impairing effort which must be directed to more immediate development of weapons systems. The Advanced Research Projects Agency will work closely, in fact already is, with other elements of the Federal Government that are concerned with science and its application to national security. The Agency is working closely with other elements of the Department of Defense, with the National Academy of Sciences, the National Science Foundation, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which, under the President's plan, will become the National Aeronautics and Space Agency.

While present plans do not contemplate construction of Advanced Research Projects Agency laboratories, need is foreseen for special-purpose facilities to prove out radically new concepts. In fact, approximately one-half of the authorization being requested is for a single classified project of this type of the highest priority.

FORMULATION OF THE PROGRAM

There are set out above what the committee considers all of the basic facts and figures of the Army, Navy, and Air Force construction programs for fiscal year 1959. Bare statistics, however, tell only what the program is. For the kind of understanding which the committee feels it is obligated to convey to the House, it is necessary also to know the how and the why.

Review procedure

Every construction program presented to the Congress by the Department of Defense is, in the first instance, based on requirements.

There are differences of opinion as to what the requirements are, and it is these differences of opinion and approach that make the program when presented to the Congress the combined thinking of the best military and civilian minds within the Department of Defense.

First step

The first step in the formulation of a military construction program is to obtain from the field offices of the military departments the needs of the individual military establishments within the geographical or other jurisdiction of each of the field offices. These requests are considered, in most instances, by the next echelon, or echelons, of field officers prior to their submission to the department concerned.

Second step

The next step is consideration within the Department itself. Here again the program goes through several processes of review, until final approval of the Secretary of the military department. Each of the Secretaries then submits his recommendations to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations). The Assistant Secretary's Office is a relatively small one, but staffed with experts in military construction and in fields allied to it. As the committee has stated in previous years, in this office, with a singleness of purpose that has been most encouraging to the committee, all of the programs are reviewed, coordinated, and assembled into a single program reflecting the overall construction needs of all of the military departments.

Original program

As originally received in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), the service requests for this year's construction program contained in excess of 2,800 line items. As indicated above, these requests had been previously screened by appropriate divisions of the military departments. As a result of this detailed review, many items were eliminated or reduced in scope or cost. The original total dollars requested was \$2,248 million. The sum recommended in the present bill is \$1,658,491,000. (This figure does not include title VI (Reserve components).)

Personal equation

The value of any construction program is in direct ratio to the amount of planning, thought, and review that is put into it. These factors, in turn, are dependent for their worth upon the individuals with the responsibility for formulating and reviewing the program. The committee is convinced that there has been great improvement over the past few years in all of these aspects of the formulation of the military construction programs. The Department of Defense and its military departments have, in the opinion of the committee, engendered a confidence in this respect that is now deserved.

Witnesses

Witnesses from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and from each of the military departments, were questioned most closely with respect to the foregoing matters, and the committee received an assurance, which by the end of the hearings it accepted completely, that every item in the bill as presented had received the closest scrutiny and consideration during every step toward its final submission to the Congress.

NEW BASES

There are no new bases, in the true sense of the term, authorized by this bill. There are several aircraft control and warning installations throughout the United States for which authority is provided in the bill. There are also some other installations which contemplate new and different activities but which are located immediately adjacent or close to existing bases and will receive their support from these existing bases.

REAL ESTATE

The real property under military control includes property owned, leased, used by permit, easement, and various occupancy rights (foreign base agreements). As of June 30, 1957, the military departments controlled approximately 35 million acres of land throughout the world. This land, together with the improvements, had an original cost to the United States of \$24.8 billion.

The real estate under military control may be grouped as follows: 27.3 million acres in the United States, together with improvements thereon, having an original cost of \$19.5 billion; 5 million acres in the Territories and possessions, together with the improvements thereon, having an original cost of \$2.6 billion; and 2.7 million acres in foreign countries together with the improvements thereon having an original cost of \$2.7 billion.

The real property acreage under military control in the United States consists of the following:

	<i>Acres</i>
Fee-owned.....	7, 669, 150
Public domain.....	15, 067, 168
Temporary use.....	2, 824, 670
Leased.....	1, 722, 558
Easements.....	67, 408
Total.....	27, 350, 954

Public domain

Attention is invited to the fact that over half of the land under military control is public domain land that has never been on the tax rolls. Only 7,669,150 acres of land under military control have been removed from the tax rolls in the United States.

Percentage of land area of United States

The 27.3 million acres under military control in the United States is approximately 1.4 percent of the total land area in the United States. The United States Government owns 408.5 million acres of land in the United States or 21.5 percent of the total land area in the United States.

Disposal

The Department of Defense, the committee was pleased to hear, is continuing its efforts to dispose of the maximum practicable amount of real property, and during the period August 27, 1955, to April 1, 1958, a total of 469 installations, or portions thereof, consisting of 1,841,076 acres of land, representing an acquisition cost of \$707,910,000, were determined to be excess within the meaning of

the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended. Altogether, the property so determined, and that which currently is being examined within the Department of Defense consists of 6,077,501 acres of land on 717 separate installations, which represents an acquisition cost of \$1,756,932,000.

Need for additional lands

New weapons systems continue to be the principal user of additional acreage being added to our inventory. However, the use of existing bases for such sites, wherever available, and the use of existing bases for support facilities kept new acquisition to a minimum and reduced the cost of constructing support facilities. Some examples of this practice which came to the committee's attention are the use of Camp Cooke, Calif., as a joint missile facility and the use of Francis E. Warren Air Force Base in Wyoming as a support location for an ICBM site.

A summary of the real estate acquisitions proposed in titles I, II, and III of the bill is shown in the following tabulation:

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Fee acquisition (acres)	Fee cost	Easement acquisition (acres)	Easement cost	Total cost
Army-----	3,952.89	\$5,957.0	7,845.00	\$4,290.0	10,247.0
Navy-----	1,337.00	2,008.0	399.00	164.0	2,172.0
Air Force ¹ -----	2,078.41	1,362.5	3,400.49	289.3	1,651.8
Total-----	7,368.30	9,327.5	11,644.49	4,743.3	14,070.8

¹ Land in addition to that shown above will be required for aircraft control and warning, ballistic missiles, and strategic missiles at various locations where the exact acreage and cost have not yet been established.

FAMILY HOUSING

Magnitude of need

Currently, there are 679,000 officers and upper grade enlisted men who require family housing. To meet this need, there are in being or planned a total 515,000 adequate housing units; 173,000 private units, 283,000 military controlled units in being or under construction, and 59,000 units planned for construction under various programs. Thus the projected deficit is on the order of 164,000 units. A summary of requirements versus assets is set forth below.

Military family housing requirements and assets

	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Gross requirements-----	678,500	246,400	¹ 167,500	264,600
Assets (existing and under contract)-----	455,800	154,300	119,250	182,250
Military controlled-----	282,800	110,300	68,250	104,250
Community support-----	173,000	44,000	51,000	78,000
Current deficit-----	222,700	92,100	48,250	82,350
Planned construction (military)-----	58,600	12,200	8,550	37,850
Projected deficit-----	164,100	79,900	39,700	44,500

¹ Shore-based personnel only.

The committee wishes to point out that the 164,000 deficit figure does not represent a programing target. As a matter of caution the Departments never provide for more than 90 percent of gross requirements, so that a minimum of 68,000 units should be subtracted to allow for this 10-percent safety factor. Furthermore, overall gross requirements are expected to drop by about 20,000 units by the end of fiscal year 1959. Unfulfilled requirement for programing in fiscal year 1960 and later years will therefore be on the order of 70,000 units, worldwide.

Need for housing line items

Section 406 of Public Law 241, 85th Congress, provided that effective July 1, 1958, no family housing project could be placed under contract unless the actual number of units involved had been specifically authorized by the annual military construction authorization bill. Therefore, there have been included in this year's bill for the first time, line items for family housing to be developed under the Capelhart and surplus commodity programs and to be acquired permissively under the Wherry acquisition program. A summary of the family housing authorizations proposed in this bill is set forth below. The 935 appropriated fund units consist of 158 Army units and 777 Air Force units, mostly at foreign locations where there is no possibility for surplus commodity programs.

	Number units Capelhart in bill	Number units surplus commodity in bill	Number units MCA in bill	Total
Army-----	9,916	934	158	11,008
Navy-----	8,308	543	0	8,851
Air Force-----	28,072	5,196	777	34,045
Total-----	46,296	6,673	935	53,904

In addition to the above, title I (Army) contains authority for the acquisition of 796 permissive Wherry units, title II (Navy) contains similar authority for 873 units, and title III (Air Force), authority for 9,374 units.

CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS BY BID

Except under unusual circumstances, all construction contracts are being awarded on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, and during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1957, 94 percent of all work placed under contract was handled in this manner. Every effort is being made to continue the practices of advertising for bids on the open market. Reports on this important aspect of contracting activity will continue to be made to the Armed Services Committees semiannually, as required by section 505 of Public Law 241, 85th Congress. Placement of contracts by negotiation will be utilized only where such procurement is clearly in the interest of national defense.

COMMITTEE CHANGES IN THE BILL

H. R. 13015 is, of course, a clean bill. During the consideration of the original bill, H. R. 12360, the committee made some 115 amendments to it. Some of the amendments represented a large number of

internal changes within the item which was amended. In one instance in a classified portion of the bill, a single amendment in the money figure actually represented 22 internal changes in that section. Therefore, the 115 amendments made to the original bill represents only those changes which were obvious on the face of the bill at the conclusion of the committee's deliberations.

A few of the changes in the bill were made at the specific request of the departments. A typical example of this is the addition in the Air Force title of an item designated as the Brunswick Naval Air Station, Maine. In this instance, the Air Force will occupy, jointly with the Navy, this installation and will require additional facilities for the naval function.

In other instances, items were added by the committee, and it is desired to point these instances out specifically. The first of these is:

Fort Huachuca, Ariz.

The committee added \$5,500,000 at Fort Huachuca to complete a technical building at this installation. The first increment of this building is scheduled for completion in September of this year. The second and last increment inserted by the committee was proposed for inclusion in last year's program but due to a limited construction budget and overriding priorities, it was deferred by the Army. Again this year it was inserted in the Army portion of the program but, again, due to budgetary limitations it was deferred.

The purpose of this technical building is to consolidate and house, in a central building, the widely scattered technical departments currently occupying inadequate and improvised facilities constructed about 1900 and temporary wood frame structures constructed in 1942. Consolidation of these activities in a new modern and functionally designed structure is necessary to effect the efficient accomplishment of the technical mission.

San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Houston, Tex.

The second of these is the addition of language (see. 110) which will require the movement of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Houston, Tex., from its present location to the previously authorized, but still unimproved, location at the Point Aux Pins area, Alabama-Mississippi. The details with respect to this particular addition appear previously in the report.

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, S. C.

For the Charleston Naval Shipyard, the committee inserted authority in the amount of \$10 million to construct a drydock. The existing drydocks at Charleston are incapable of accommodating the new fleet ballistic missile submarines. Since this type of submarine will operate from this area, it is essential that a dock be provided of sufficient capacity to perform the necessary overhaul and repair on them. This dock will be 750 feet in length and 150 feet wide and will be adequate to provide total services for the submarines. It appears that this project has recently received a high priority within the Navy Department but had not been included in the program because of rapid developments subsequent to its formulation.

NAAS, Kingsville, Tex.

Another of these in the bill involves the construction of two barracks at the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Tex., at a cost

of \$1,041,000. The 10 existing inadequate 172-man barracks were constructed in 1942 and are in very poor structural condition due to termite damage and dryrot. The buildings also constitute a fire hazard because of sagging, overloaded electrical wires and poor quality heating units. Other details have been furnished that indicate that the construction of these 2 barracks for 504 enlisted men are indeed well justified.

NAS, San Diego, Calif.

For the Naval Air Station, San Diego, Calif., authority in the amount of \$7 million was added for the construction of a new marginal wharf and the provision of necessary utilities and services. The project also contemplates deepening the existing entrance channel and dredging a turning basin. The *Forrestal* class carriers are now assigned for operation in the Pacific. The commander, Naval Air Forces, Pacific, has requested war facilities to be provided at the Naval Air Station, North Island. The existing harbor entrance channel depths within San Diego Harbor are too shallow to accommodate these carriers. Also, there does not exist in the San Diego area an accessible wharf of sufficient size equipped with adequate utilities to berth, refuel, and service this class of carrier. The committee ascertained that if this authority were not granted, fleet logistic support for the naval air station would be curtailed and these aircraft carriers would have to be supported by tankers and supply ships, a vastly more costly and dangerous operation than furnishing such support at wharfside.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Calif.

In this instance, the committee added \$5,500,000 to the requested \$500,000 for the Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Calif. This shipyard has had an interesting recent history occasioned by its subsidence. At its present lowest point, the shipyard has sunk 17 feet. The apparent reason for this subsidence is the withdrawal of oil from the Wilmington oilfield. Indeed, oil is being removed immediately below the shipyard itself. This withdrawal of oil has resulted in a compaction of the oil-bearing sands, with the result that not only the shipyard but a relatively large area of that portion of Long Beach has sunk and is continuing to sink. A special study of this matter was made by a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee last year, and its findings are set out in the printed hearings for the military construction bill for fiscal year 1958.

The \$500,000 originally requested was for further protective works designed to prevent flooding of the shipyard. Recently the California Legislature passed legislation which will involve the repressurization of this area by the injection of salt water. It is hoped that this action will prevent further subsidence. Since the authorities of the State and of the city of Long Beach and the oil operators in that area appear to be joining in a cooperative effort to prevent subsidence, the committee felt that it should provide further impetus to this program by authorizing what is hoped to be the last authority for protective works at the shipyard.

It is pointed out that only \$500,000 of the \$6 million total can be utilized for protective works "until the Secretary of the Navy determines in his judgment that sufficient action has been taken or arrangements made to arrest further subsidence of the shipyard."

Classified facilities

Also, in the Navy title, an item in the amount of \$10,300,000 was added for classified facilities. The nature of this construction involves security and cannot, therefore, be described in this report. The committee assures the House, however, that the facilities are of a most important nature and would inevitably have appeared in next year's program. Certain progress in other areas related to the inserted item indicate that this facility should be speeded in order that it will be in existence when the missiles and other related items are ready to utilize the facility.

School of Aviation Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base, Tex.

This item involves the granting of authority in the amount of \$12 million to construct facilities at the School of Aviation Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex. This amount will be sufficient to construct seven laboratories and similar structures and to provide utilities and collateral equipment and provide an addition to the heating and air-conditioning plant. Typical of the facilities to be provided under this authority are a bioelectronics laboratory, a bioastronautics laboratory, a cellular physiology laboratory, and a biodynamics laboratory.

The overall plan for the School of Aviation Medicine contemplated, a few years ago, a total expenditure of some \$30 million for a complete facility. Something less than \$10 million has already been authorized and appropriated, and the school is a functioning part of the Air Force at this time. It performs important work for not only the Air Force but for the Army and the Navy, too, and also cooperates with other elements of the Government whose activities in any way relate to the reactions on the human body of extreme speeds, gravity pull, and, today, space activities. Testimony given the committee by the commanding officer of the school indicated that it was the only school of its kind in the world. The testimony further indicated, however, that great advances in this field have been made in the Soviet Union in the past several years and that there is, of course, a danger that the United States might fall behind in an area which is an absolute essential to the proper and efficient performance of man at high speeds within the earth's atmosphere and, of course, of even greater essentiality in the current and projected space age. Unfortunately, in the committee's opinion, the development of facilities of this kind are such that they frequently tend to drop from a construction program prior to its presentation to Congress. Always it seems that things of a more immediately practical nature receive precedence. The committee is convinced that, if the United States is to stay ahead in this more important field, the Congress must exercise its authority to insure that this important type of research proceed with maximum vigor.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, La.

At Barksdale Air Force Base, there are a large number of enlisted men's dormitories which were built, in the first instance, with a contemplated life of only 5 years. There has been a need for some time for the replacement of these barracks in order to provide proper quarters for the enlisted men stationed at this base. For this reason, the committee added \$925,000 to the Barksdale Air Force Base program in order to provide some of these urgently needed facilities.

Section 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as found in title 40, United States Code, sections 259, and 267, provides as follows:

SEC. 259. No money shall be paid nor contracts made for payment for any site for a public building in excess of the amount specifically appropriated therefor.

SEC. 267. No money shall be expended upon any public building until after sketch plans showing the tentative design and arrangement of such building, together with outline description and detailed estimates of the cost thereof, shall have been made by the Administrator of General Services (except when otherwise authorized by law) and said sketch plans and estimates shall have been approved by the head of each executive department who will have officials located in such building; but such approval shall not prevent subsequent changes in the design, arrangement, materials, or methods of construction or cost which may be found necessary or advantageous: *Provided*, That no such changes shall be made involving an expense in excess of the limit of cost fixed or extended by Congress, and all appropriations made for the construction of such building shall be expended within the limit of cost so fixed or extended.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

These follow the pattern established in prior military construction acts, and a description of each is outlined below:

Section 501

This section is general authorizing language which has appeared for several years in military construction bills. It will be noted that the authorities granted may be exercised without regard to certain sections of the Revised Statutes and two sections of title 10, United States Code. The laws which will have no application to the construction authorized by this bill are as follows:

Section 3648 of the Revised Statutes as found in title 31, United States Code, section 529, provides in part as follows:

No advance of public money shall be made in any case unless authorized by the appropriation concerned or other law. And in all cases of contracts for the performance of any service, or the delivery of articles of any description for the use of the United States, payment shall not exceed the value of the service rendered, or of the articles delivered previously to such payment.

There are situations in connection with public-works projects where it may be necessary to advance money prior to the actual receipt of the service or the property to be obtained. For example, where utilities such as power, gas, or water lines are required to be installed and it is necessary for a private utility company to extend its lines to the military installation, the military department oftentimes must pay for the costs of such extension. These payments are eventually recouped by deductions from the periodic payments made for the service to the utility company. However, in the strict sense, such

initial payment for installation costs are advance payments for the service rendered.

In regard to that part of Revised Statutes 3734 as found in title 40, United States Code, section 259, the committee feels that the key to the analysis of that provision are the words "specifically appropriated therefor." It will be noted that the bill permits a 5-percent (United States) and 10-percent (overseas) variation for projects authorized by the bill in order to provide necessary elasticity. It is entirely possible that this elasticity would be lost were the construction subject to this section of the Revised Statutes.

With respect to the second part of Revised Statutes 3734 found in title 40, United States Code, section 267, regarding the making by the General Services of sketch plans, outline descriptions, and detailed estimates of the cost of any public building, it is not believed that such was intended nor should apply to the varied and multitudinous projects authorized by the military construction authorization acts. Such a requirement would place a great administrative burden on the General Services Administration which could only result in serious delay.

Section 9774 (d), title 10, United States Code—

(d) Except when built by members of the Air Force, no permanent barrack, quarters, building, or other permanent structure may be built unless a detailed estimate of its cost has been submitted to Congress and a specific appropriation has been made therefor. No one may build such a structure without specific authority of Congress if the cost is more than \$100,000.

It is pointed out that detailed estimates of cost are not available in many cases until the project has been authorized by Congress and an architect and engineering contract has been let and performed.

It will be noted also that the authority granted by this section may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes. This provision of law provides in pertinent part as follows:

Section 355, Revised Statutes—

No public money shall be expended upon any site or land purchased by the United States for the purposes of erecting thereon any armory, arsenal, fort, fortification, navy yard, customhouse, lighthouse, or other public building of any kind whatever, until the written opinion of the Attorney General shall be had in favor of the validity of the title * * *.

It should be clearly understood that the exception from the requirement that title to land be approved by the Attorney General prior to the exercise of the authorities granted in this bill does not mean that the opinion of the Attorney General will not be obtained. It means merely that urgent construction can proceed prior to the rendering of such an opinion by him.

Sections 502 and 503

These sections relate merely to totals in the bill and percentage variations allowable in the cost of projects and repeat similar provisions in Public Law 241, 85th Congress.

Section 504

This section authorizes the use of existing unused authorization for family housing under previous Military Construction Authorization Acts (Public Law 765, 83d Cong.; Public Law 161, 84th Cong.; and Public Law 968, 84th Cong.) to provide family housing at those installations for which appropriated fund family housing authorization is requested in this bill.

Section 505

Section 505 provides that whenever the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, would interfere with the authorizations granted for construction in foreign countries, and the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for auditing contracts for this construction, the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section. The provision of law referred to is as follows:

Section 2313 (b), title 10, United States Code—

(b) Each contract negotiated under this chapter shall provide that the Comptroller General and his representatives are entitled, until the expiration of three years after final payment, to examine any books, documents, papers, or records of the contractor, or any of his subcontractors, that directly pertain to, and involve transactions relating to, the contract or subcontract.

Section 506

This section relates to the awarding of contracts on a competitive basis, and to the requirement that the military department shall report to the Congress with respect to contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis. The first of the laws referred to is the Armed Services Procurement Act. The second law referred to, which is self-explanatory, is as follows:

Section 15 of the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547, 551)—

SEC. 15. Section 3 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

“(c) All bids or invitations for bids shall contain in their specifications all the necessary language and material required and shall be so descriptive both in its language and attachments thereto in order to permit full and free competition. Any bid or invitation to bid which shall not carry the necessary descriptive language and attachments thereto, or if such attachments are not available or accessible to all competent, reliable bidders, such bid or invitation to bid shall be invalid and any award or awards made to any bidder in such case shall be invalidated and rejected.”

Section 507

This section advances for 2 years the general rescission provisions now contained in section 506 of Public Law 241, 85th Congress. This continues in effect the established policy of repealing long-standing military construction authorizations that have not been

used by the military departments. As a result, after July 1, 1959, only those authorizations, with certain specified exceptions, which are contained in public laws enacted subsequent to August 3, 1956, would continue to be available. Under this section, unused authorization that has been in effect 3 years will be automatically rescinded.

Section 508

This section would repeal section 408 (b) of Public Law 564, 81st Congress, which directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Congress, at the beginning of the first session of each Congress, all military construction authorization enacted since the 80th Congress, for which adequate funds have not been appropriated, and to recommend to the Congress which portions of this unused authorization should be rescinded.

Under present procedures, the amount of all residual unfunded authorization is always reported to Congress by the Department of Defense in its presentation of the annual MCA bill. Therefore, as this information is now reported annually, the requirement for a biennial report, as specified by Public Law 564, would not appear necessary.

In view of the provisions of section 507 of this bill, under which all unused authorization that has been in effect 3 years is automatically rescinded, there is no longer any need to recommend biennially unused authorization to Congress for rescission. Moreover, under present program management procedures, large accumulations of unused authorizations are no longer allowed to occur.

Section 509

This section would extend through fiscal year 1961, the previously enacted leasing authority for housing at tactical installations, so that Nike and other tactical site housing requirements may be met by utilizing existing private housing to the greatest possible extent, thereby reducing the necessity for construction of military quarters.

Section 510

Section 510 would amend section 406 of Public Law 968, 84th Congress, which authorizes land acquisition projects not exceeding \$5,000, to authorize a new limit of \$25,000 for each land acquisition project. In addition, the restriction of this section to projects which are urgently required has been eliminated. These changes are desired in order to better carry out the original intent of section 406, Public Law 968/84, which was to expedite the handling of small real estate acquisition projects, and to reduce the administrative workload involved in these small transactions.

Section 511

This section would add a new subsection to section 408 (a) of Public Law 968, 84th Congress, which would exempt small, routine construction projects costing \$5,000 or less from the present requirement that a determination be made that they are urgently required. The committee found that this method of handling these minor, low-cost construction projects requires an excessive amount of administration and delay which would be eliminated by the change proposed in section 511.

Section 512

This section would amend section 406 of Public Law 241, 85th Congress, so as to exempt two additional categories of family housing from the present requirement for inclusion in the annual military construction authorization act. The reasons for the specific exemptions in this section are as follows:

(1) Mandatory Wherry acquisition projects were exempted from the requirement for inclusion in the annual military construction authorization act by Public Law 241, 85th Congress. This subsection would remain unchanged.

(2) Leased housing is proposed to be exempted because such housing, if acquired at all, must be acquired on short notice as the housing becomes available. It would be impractical to plan such acquisitions sufficiently far in advance to permit annual line item authorization.

(3) Rental guaranty housing is, in reality, not military construction. Rental guaranty projects are constructed with foreign capital and are owned throughout their existence by these foreign interests. The interest of our Government in them is simply the guaranty of a certain percentage of occupancy for a limited period of time in order to encourage the foreign investors to construct the housing and to reserve the houses for United States personnel. The Armed Forces have no way of knowing in what areas economic conditions will be such as to encourage local investors to finance and construct rental guaranty projects. Furthermore, delaying the implementation of a rental guaranty project until a new authorization act is passed might, in many cases, preclude the building of the project. In many countries, economic conditions change so rapidly that a delay might well remove the possibility of finding interested sponsors.

The committee added a new provision to section 512 permitting some elasticity in the siting of Capehart housing. As is indicated previously in the report, this year, for the first time, all housing to be constructed or acquired for use by the military must appear in the bill as line items. With the rapid development of missiles and for many other reasons, including changes in missions and increases in the complement of particular stations, needs for housing will arise that could not possibly have been foreseen at the time the committee completed its deliberations on the construction bill. Therefore, if an urgent requirement arises for Capehart housing at a location which was not designated by line item, another less urgent project can be deferred, or a number of projects lessened in number of units, in order to provide housing for the new site. It will be noted that the amendment requires that the Secretaries of the military departments notify the Armed Services Committee immediately upon reaching a decision to utilize this authority.

• CHANGES IN TOTALS

The bill as submitted to the committee totaled, for titles I, II, III, and IV, \$1,684,361,000 for new line items (not including authorities for title VI, the Reserve components). The 115 amendments to the bill mentioned above resulted in substantial deletions and also substantial additions. The result, as carried in the totals on page 63 of H. R. 13015, indicate that the bill, after all of these changes, has been decreased by \$25,870,000 for a new total of \$1,658,491,000.

EXPLANATION OF TITLE VI

(RESERVE COMPONENT FACILITIES)

The National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 (Public Law 783, 81st Cong.) authorized the acquisition and construction of facilities for the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, which authorization was amended by Public Law 302 of the 84th Congress and Public Law 85-215. Permanent provisions of the foregoing law have been codified in chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, or are included in pending amendments thereto.

Report No. 696, House of Representatives, 85th Congress, 1st session, based on hearings before the Committee on Armed Services preceding enactment of Public Law 85-215, stated that sufficient increase in the general authorization for facilities for the Reserve components would be provided for fiscal year 1958, but that thereafter "the Department of Defense should request annual authorizations on a line-item basis." Title VI of the proposed legislation would provide such specific project authorization for fiscal year 1959, together with certain other provisions necessary to effect the transition from the general authorization heretofore granted by the Congress to the line-item type required for future programs.

Title VI of the proposed legislation is premised upon retention of the provisions of chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, to the fullest extent compatible with the expressed intent of the Congress. The only substantive amendment of that chapter would be the deletion of the requirement for "consultation" with the Armed Services Committees with respect to the projects to be undertaken by the Secretary of Defense, and substitution therefor of a provision requiring authorization by law of specific projects, with certain exceptions.

Title VI would have authorized specific projects for the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Air Force Reserve and the Air National Guard. Additional authorization was not requested by the Department of Defense for the Army Reserve and Army National Guard inasmuch as it was the Department of Defense position that projects heretofore authorized and appropriated for, but remaining unconstructed, were sufficient in number to cover the approved obligation program of construction during fiscal year 1959 for both of these Reserve components.

The committee takes a contrary position and added line item projects for the Army National Guard and Army Reserve as will be explained later in this report.

Title VI would also continue the authorizations previously granted for those facilities which have been the subject of consultation with the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives before July 1, 1958, provided they are placed under construction contract before July 1, 1960 and are funded from appropriations made prior to enactment of the proposed legislation.

As has been stated the committee could not agree with the Department of Defense that the best interests of the Reserve components would be served by failing to authorize additional projects for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve. It is true that the Army National Guard presently has \$17.7 million funded and unob-

ligated authorization as of June 30, 1958 and that the Army Reserve has \$30.8 million funded and unobligated authorization as of the same date. However, these unobligated authorizations exist only because the Department of Defense has not permitted these two Reserve components to obligate these authorizations. As of consequence, the Army Reserve and Army National Guard have fallen behind the other Reserve components in their Reserve facilities construction program. It is a fact that in all the Reserve components the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve have the greatest need for additional training facilities. The National Guard Bureau estimates that of the total requirement of 2,780 armories there still is a deficiency of 764 armories to be built before the Army National Guard can complete its program. Of the total Army Reserve requirement of 1,800 Reserve training centers only 717 have been constructed, leaving a deficiency of 1,083.

Insofar as the Army National Guard is concerned there is also for consideration the amount of funds which have been appropriated by the State legislatures. There is presently in excess of \$35 million available in State funds as matching contributions for the construction of Army National Guard armories. The committee believes that the States have more than done their part under the provisions of the law for providing the necessary State funds and the Federal Government should now provide matching funds so that the Army National Guard construction program can proceed and keep pace with the other Reserve components.

As a consequence the committee added projects for both the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard totaling \$11,042,000.

The total amount recommended by the committee for Reserve component construction is \$39,958,000. This exceeds the original Department of Defense proposal by \$9,818,000. Even so, the committee believes this to be a modest authorization when the need for Reserve facilities is considered. Furthermore, it should be remembered that in fiscal year 1958 the Congress authorized \$80 million for Reserve facilities construction, and thus the authorization for fiscal year 1959 is less than one-half the amount authorized for fiscal year 1958.

BACKGROUND OF THE BASIC LAW

Prior to World War II, our Reserves were relatively small. In the various States the National Guard was geared to the requirements of the States concerned rather than into a pattern for mobilization requirements in the event of total war. Since the war it has been a matter of almost constant discussion as to how large a Reserve should be maintained.

Until the enactment of the basic law, one of the most important limiting factors in developing the Reserve was the lack of proper armories and other facilities needed for training purposes. That law has gone a long way in correcting this deficiency, but there is still a long road to travel before the deficiency is met. The law gave an impetus to the Reserve program which cannot be overestimated. Upon the enactment of the law the civilian Reserve components felt that they were no longer a forgotten group. It provided a spur and an encouragement which has manifested itself in infinitely more interest in the Reserve program than had ever before been experienced.

■ Prior to the enactment of the basic law, the Federal Government paid for the construction of armories for its Reserves, but it had never contributed to the construction of armories for the National Guard, on the basis that such construction was the responsibility of the States. Public Law 783, 81st Congress, provided authority for the Secretary of Defense to continue the construction of facilities for Reserves other than National Guard, and in addition made provision that the Secretary could contribute to any State the entire cost necessary to expand, rehabilitate or convert existing National Guard facilities so as to provide joint facilities which could then be used by the National Guard and other Reserve components. Section 3 (c) of that law provided that the Secretary could contribute to any State a portion of the funds for construction or expansion of armories where the need for such had been brought about by the expansion of the National Guard or the Air National Guard of the United States in order to meet Federal requirements. Such contributions are limited to 75 percent of the total cost, the States to provide the land necessary in addition to their 25 percent contribution.

The original law provided in part, that the Secretary of Defense might acquire reserve facilities, by construction or otherwise, over a period of 5 fiscal years and might have appropriated during that time not to exceed \$250 million. In 1955 Public Law 302, 84th Congress, extended that time limitation for an additional 3 years and increased the authorization by another \$250 million. In 1957 Public Law 85-215 again increased the authorization by another \$80 million but retained the time limitation as previously established; viz, through June 30, 1958.

Provision was also made in the law for consultation with the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives in order that the committees might be kept continuously advised with respect to operations under the law.

PROGRESS OF PROGRAM TO DATE AND FUTURE REQUIREMENTS

Table 1 summarizes the utilization made of the authorization previously provided.

TABLE 1.—*Reserve Forces facilities—Utilization of authorizations and appropriations provided under the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended*

[In millions of dollars]

	Army National Guard	Army Reserve	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve	Air Force Reserve	Air National Guard	Total
Authorizations and appropriations	139.3	105.4	² 80.9	54.5	¹ 174.3	² 554.4
Constructed and under construction:						
Planned as of June 30, 1958	121.6	74.6	70.1	39.4	174.3	480.0
Actual as of Apr. 30, 1958	110.3	62.4	63.5	36.3	154.0	426.5
Residual authorization funded, estimated June 30, 1958	17.7	30.8	² 10.8	15.1	¹ 0	74.4

¹ Air National Guard funds are "1-year" and unobligated funds expire June 30.

² Does not include \$1.9 million of unobligated prior-year appropriations for which specific project authorization is contained in the proposed legislation.

Navy (aviation, surface, Marine Corps)

The Naval Reserve aviation program, which also supports Marine Corps Reserve aviation, is composed of 22 activities. Six of these are Naval Air Reserve training units situated on Regular air stations and the remainder are Reserve air stations. Foreseeable requirements to keep these activities in step with the demands of modern aircraft and associated equipment amounts to \$125 million. This includes replacement of those buildings which are deteriorated beyond economical repair, modernization of other buildings, and modernization of operations facilities.

The Naval Reserve surface program consists of 319 training centers and facilities, and 184 electronic facilities and stations. A major effort is now under way to reorganize sizable segments of the surface program into crews ready on short notice to man antisubmarine warfare ships for immediate augmentation of the fleet in an emergency. This will necessitate the providing of some berthing facilities and dockside services in conjunction with the adjacent training centers. Modernization and replacement of overage temporary buildings previously mentioned is required. The total foreseeable requirements for the Naval Reserve surface program are estimated at \$29 million.

The Marine Corps Reserve ground facilities establishment consists of 231 training centers, 163 of which are combined with the Naval Reserve training centers mentioned above. Although no additional centers are required, replacement, expansion, or modernization of some of the present facilities is urgently required. Foreseeable needs are estimated to cost about \$8 million.

Thus, there is a foreseeable requirement of \$162 million for the overall program. Of this, it is proposed to accomplish about \$15 million in fiscal year 1959.

The fiscal year 1959 authorization program as contained in the proposed legislation, includes provisions for—

- (a) Replacement of 4 training centers;
- (b) Replacement of 10 electronic facilities;
- (c) Improvements to 4 training centers and 3 ships' operations facilities;
- (d) Acquisition of 2 sites of presently used centers;
- (e) Improvements and modernization at 12 naval air stations.

In planning for this program, the principle of joint utilization is observed to the utmost, as required by law. A summary of this joint utilization follows:

- (a) All Naval Reserve aviation facilities are jointly used;
- (b) 74 percent of Naval Reserve surface training centers/facilities are jointly used;
- (c) 71 percent of Marine Corps Reserve training centers are jointly used.

Through fiscal year 1958 a total of \$83 million has been appropriated to carry out this program. To date, a little more than \$64 million has been obligated and it is expected this total will be raised to \$70 million by end fiscal year 1958.

Air Force

The established mobilization requirement of the Air Reserve Forces is 39 combat flying wings. Twenty-four of these wings, consisting of 83 combat squadrons of the fighter and tactical reconnaissance types,

make up the tactical force of the Air National Guard and there are 15 medium troop carrier wings of 45 tactical squadrons in the Air Force Reserve.

In addition, there are 157 support type units of the Air Reserve and Air National Guard which have been programed to meet specific mobilization requirements in the fields of communications, weather, air resupply, air evacuation, terminal operations, air rescue, and hospital type units.

The Air National Guard operates 93 flying bases and 41 nonflying bases. Construction plans for fiscal year 1959 and future years do not contemplate establishing any new bases except Bethel, Minn., under present programs, missions, and aircraft assignment. Certain construction is necessary to complete some of the newer facilities; to replace World War II temporary construction; to expand facilities, particularly runways, taxiways, and aprons to accommodate higher performance aircraft being received; and to complete the program of providing flight simulator and rocket storage buildings, which only recently became a requirement of the program as advanced model jet aircraft are received. To summarize, the conversion of a World War II temporary base structure to a modernized plant capable of operating Century series jets will, over a period of 15 years, require about \$254 million of construction which should be approximately 80 percent complete this year, assuming the entire amount in progress this year gets under contract.

For the Air Force Reserve, \$54.5 million has been funded under the authorization provided through fiscal year 1958. The facilities provided through the expenditure of these funds has contributed immeasurably to the attainment of the high degree of combat capability which exists in our Reserve troop carrier units today. Of the 37 flying bases required to support our flying units, 34 are now in operation with a good percentage of the minimum operational facilities required having been provided. The remaining three bases required are now under construction and will be completed during fiscal year 1959. To round out all facilities needed at the flying bases of the Air Force Reserve will require approximately \$29 million after fiscal year 1959. Five Air Reserve centers (nonflying) have been constructed, 1 is under construction, and 1 is programed from currently available funds. No additional centers are planned for construction at this time since priority will still continue to be given to the construction of the facilities required for our flying units. Once this construction has been accomplished, reviews will be made of individual locations and, where it is determined that such construction meets the best interests of the Government, action will be taken to include these centers in a future construction program.

Army Reserve and National Guard

Since 1951, the Army has had appropriated to it \$244.7 million, of which \$139.2 million represents contributions made, or to be made, to the States for the National Guard armory and nonarmory programs, and \$105.4 million represents facilities for the Army Reserve.

In the National Guard armory program 916 of the 2,089 armories constructed by the States without Federal assistance represent adequate facilities for continued use, against a total requirement of 2,250 armories as estimated by the Department of the Army; the States

and the National Guard Bureau, however, estimate total requirements as 2,780 armories. These estimates remain to be reconciled upon completion of the new troop unit program under the "Pentomic Division" organizational structure, and the revised plan of distribution of these units throughout the States. A total of 1,100 armories have been constructed, are under construction, or are funded within \$115 million of the total appropriations heretofore made available for the National Guard. Thus the remaining requirement for National Guard armories will range between 234 and 764 upon completion of the revised troop unit program by the Department of the Army. Approximately \$24 million of the total appropriations heretofore made available for the National Guard represent nonarmory facilities (maintenance shops, supply and administrative facilities) which have been constructed, are under construction or are programed for early initiation.

In the Army Reserve center program 332 of the 1,783 facilities acquired by lease or donation, and now in use, represent facilities adequate for continued use, against an estimated total requirement of 1,800 centers. A total of 385 centers have been constructed, are under construction, or are funded within the \$105.4 million appropriations heretofore made available for Army Reserve construction. Thus the remaining requirement for Army Reserve centers is estimated at 1,083 centers, representing a future authorization and funding requirement of \$235 million. This requirement, also, may be subject to revision upon completion of the new troop unit program under the "Pentomic Division" organizational structure, and the revised plan of distribution of these Army Reserve units throughout the States.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment into law of this proposed legislation will involve the expenditure of \$1,762,904,000. Of this amount, \$39,958,000 represents Reserve components construction.

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

This measure is part of the legislative program of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1959 and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget in its original form as is evidenced by letter dated May 1, 1958, from Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy and by letter dated May 1, 1958, from Deputy Secretary of Defense, Donald A. Quarles, which are set out below and made a part of this report.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 1, 1958.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1958, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to its presentation to the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted.

This proposed legislation would authorize additional military construction that is urgently needed by the Department of Defense at this time, and would provide additional authority to cover deficiencies in prior construction authorizations. The appropriation of money required for construction is provided for in the budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year 1959.

This legislation consists of titles I, II, III, and IV, covering authorization required by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the Department of Defense, respectively; and title V covering general provisions relating to this legislation.

This proposal would authorize new construction totaling \$1,684,361,000, of which \$347,028,000 is for the Department of the Army; \$301,062,000 is for the Department of the Navy; \$986,271,000 is for the Department of the Air Force; and \$50 million is for the Department of Defense. This proposal would also provide additional monetary authority to correct deficiencies in authorization for projects authorized under previous laws totaling \$47,238,000, of which \$13,630,000 is for the Army; \$15,825,000 is for the Navy; and \$17,783,000 is for the Air Force. Therefore, the total in this proposed legislation of new authorization plus additional monetary authority for projects previously authorized amounts to \$1,731,599,000.

This proposal would also repeal as of July 1, 1959, all authorizations, with certain exceptions, for military construction that are contained in laws enacted prior to August 4, 1956. This repeal will continue in effect the policy established in the fiscal year 1956 Military Construction Authorization Act (Public Law 161, 84th Cong.) and continued in the fiscal year 1957 and 1958 acts, of repealing long-standing authority that has not been exercised by the military departments. It is believed that the continuation of this policy will result in a construction program which will reflect more accurately the current needs of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

NEIL McELROY.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 1, 1958.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation to provide additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, together with a sectional analysis thereof.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1958, and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 (Public Law 783, 81st Cong.) authorized the acquisition and construction of facilities for the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, which authorization was amended by Public Law 302 of the 84th Congress and Public

Law 85-215. Permanent provisions of the foregoing legislation have been codified in chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, or are included in pending amendments thereto.

Report No. 696, House of Representatives, 85th Congress, 1st session, based on hearings before the Committee on Armed Services preceding enactment of Public Law 85-215, stated that sufficient increase in the general authorization for facilities for the Reserve components would be provided for fiscal year 1958, but that thereafter "the Department of Defense should request annual authorizations on a line-item basis." The proposed legislation would provide such specific project authorization for fiscal year 1959, together with certain other provisions necessary to effect the transition from the general authorization heretofore granted by the Congress to the line-item type required for future programs.

The proposed legislation is premised upon retention of the provisions of chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, to the fullest extent compatible with the expressed intent of the Congress. The only substantive amendment of that chapter would be the deletion of the requirement for "consultation" with the Armed Services Committees with respect to the projects to be undertaken by the Secretary of Defense, and substitution therefor of a provision requiring authorization by law of specific projects, with certain exceptions.

The proposed legislation would authorize specific projects for the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard. Additional authorization is not requested for the Army Reserve and Army National Guard inasmuch as projects heretofore authorized and appropriated for, but remaining unconstructed, are sufficient in number to cover the approved obligation program of construction during fiscal year 1959 for both of these Reserve components.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposed legislation would authorize the appropriation of funds for specific line items in the amount of \$11,892,000 for the Department of the Navy; \$6,272,000 for the Air Force Reserve; and \$11,976,000 for the Air National Guard of the United States, of which \$8 million is included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1959 for the Department of the Navy, an undetermined amount not exceeding \$6,272,000 for the Air Force Reserve, and \$9,600,000 for the Air National Guard of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD A. QUARLES.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, there is herewith printed in parallel columns the text of provisions of existing law which would be repealed or amended by the various provisions of the bill.

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

The Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531) (Public Law 85-241)

(Sec. 201:)

The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing, permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Aviation Facilities

(Special Purpose Air Stations)

Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities (including operational facilities on San Nicolas Island), \$7,669,000.

The Act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended (Public Law 326, 83d Congress)

(Sec. 9:)

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of \$135,425,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act, of which not to exceed \$26,000,000 shall be appropriated for any period beginning prior to January 1, 1955. Of the amount so appropriated for any such period, not to exceed \$1,858,000 may be utilized for the purpose of section 4 of this Act.

The Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531) (Public Law 85-241)

(Sec. 506:)

As of July 1, 1958, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment

(Sec. 209:)

Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, as amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, insert before "\$7,669,000" the words "and land acquisition,".

(Sec. 309:)

Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure "\$135,425,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure "\$139,797,000".

(Sec. 507:)

As of July 1, 1959, all authorization for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment

EXISTING LAW

or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before July 28, 1954, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts in whole or in part before July 1, 1958, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress;

(4) the authorizations for public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in sections 2231–2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886);

(5) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$60,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress;

(6) notwithstanding the provisions of section 410 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), the authorization for (a) development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343), and (b) development of classified facilities in the

THE BILL

or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 4, 1956, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisition in whole or in part before July 1, 1959, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) the authorizations for public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in sections 2231–2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886);

(5) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$30,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(6) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

(7) the authorization for public works and for the appropriation of funds that are contained in the Act of April 1, 1954

EXISTING LAW

amount of \$6,654,000 that is contained in title I, section 102 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609); and

(7) the authorization for public works and for the appropriations of funds that are contained in the Act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended.

THE BILL

(68 Stat. 47), as amended; and

(8) notwithstanding the provision of section 506 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 558), the authorization for:

(a) jet engine test cells in the amount of \$1,850,000 at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia, that is contained in title II, section 201 under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" of the Act of August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 440, 442), as amended:

(b) ammunition storage facilities in the amount of \$225,000 at the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California; navigational aids in the amount of \$590,000 at the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California; research and development facilities in the amount of \$1,804,000 at the Naval Air Turbine Test Station, Trenton, New Jersey; and navigational aids in the amount of \$400,000 at the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, that are contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 540), as amended;

(c) the development of aviation ordnance facilities in the amount of \$2,638,000 that is contained in title II, section 202, of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 543), as amended.

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

The Act of June 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 236) (Public Law 564, 81st Congress)

(Sec. 408:)

(a) There is hereby rescinded, as of December 31, 1949, any authority conferred by any Act of Congress enacted prior to the beginning of the Eightieth Congress to proceed with any project or projects for the establishment or development of military, naval, or air-force installations and facilities by the construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, unless funds to be used for the exercise of such authority have been appropriated on or before December 31, 1949.

(b) The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to make a report to the Congress at the beginning of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, and at the beginning of the first session of each succeeding Congress, listing all projects for the establishment or development of military, naval, or air-force installations and facilities by the construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works which have been authorized by the Congress subsequent to the beginning of the Eightieth Congress and for which adequate funds for the completion thereof have not been appropriated. The report shall include any recommendations which the Secretary of Defense deems appropriate with respect to the rescission of all, or any portion, of the authority to proceed with any such project.

(c) Nothing in subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be deemed to relate to any project authorized to be prosecuted by the Department of the Army in the exercise of the civilian functions of the Corps of Engineers.

(Sec. 508:)

Section 408 (b) of the Act of June 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 236, 245), is hereby repealed.

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

The Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), as amended (Public Law 161, 84th Congress)

(Sec. 515:)

During the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than five thousand of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit.

The Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991) (Public Law 968, 84th Congress)

(Sec. 406:)

The Secretaries of the military departments may acquire land, and interests in land, not exceeding \$5,000 in cost (exclusive of administrative costs and deficiency judgment awards), which the Secretary concerned determines to be urgently required in the interests of national defense. The authority under this section may not, however, be used to acquire more than one parcel of land unless the

(Sec. 509:)

Sec. 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1958 through and including 1961, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than five thousand of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit."

(Sec. 510:)

Section 406 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1015), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of a military department may acquire any interest in land that—

"(1) he or his designee determines is needed in the interest of national defense; and

"(2) does not cost more than \$25,000 (exclusive of adminis-

EXISTING LAW

parcels are noncontiguous or, if contiguous, do not exceed \$5,000 in total cost.

The Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991) (Public Law 968, 84th Congress)

(Sec. 408:)

(a) Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments may expend out of appropriations available for military construction such amounts as may be required for the establishment and development of military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing (except family quarters), converting, extending, or installing permanent or temporary public works determined to be urgently required, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for projects not otherwise authorized by law when the cost of the project is not in excess of \$200,000, subject to the following limitations:

(1) No such project, the cost of which is in excess of \$50,000, shall be authorized unless approved in advance by the Secretary of Defense.

(2) No such project, the cost of which is in excess of \$25,000 shall be authorized unless approved in advance by the Secretary of the military department concerned.

(3) Not more than one allotment may be made for any project authorized under this section.

(4) The cost of conversion of existing structures to family quarters may not exceed \$50,000 in any fiscal year at any single facility.

THE BILL

trative costs and the amounts of any deficiency judgments). This section does not authorize the acquisition, as part of the same project, of two or more contiguous parcels of land that together cost more than \$25,000."

(Sec. 511:)

Section 408 (a) of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(5) No determination that a project is urgently required shall be necessary for projects, the cost of which is not in excess of \$5,000."

EXISTING LAW

(b) The Secretaries of the military departments may expend out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation amounts necessary to accomplish a project which, except for the fact that its cost does not exceed \$25,000, would otherwise be authorized to be accomplished under subsection (a).

(c) The Secretary of each department shall report in detail semiannually to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives with respect to the exercise of the authorities granted by this section.

(d) Section 26 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 853, 856; 34 U. S. C. 559), is repealed.

The Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531) (Public Law 85-241)

(Sec. 406:)

(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units (other than housing units required to be acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955) shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization act.

(b) Effective July 1, 1958, the provisions of section 419, Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, second session, are hereby repealed.

THE BILL

(Sec. 512:)

Subsection (a) of section 046 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), is amended to read as follows:

“(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization Act except (1) housing units required to be acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) housing units leased, utilizing available operation and maintenance appropriations, for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions of section 417 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1018); and (3) rental guaranty

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

family housing authorized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622).

Title 10, United States Code

(Sec. 2662:)

Real property transactions: agreement with Armed Services Committees; reports.

(Sec. 513:)

(a) Section 2662, Title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(a) The Secretary of a military department, or his designee, must come to an agreement with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives before entering into any of the following transactions by or for the use of that department:

(1) An acquisition of fee title to any real property, if the estimated price is more than \$25,000.

(2) A lease of any real property to the United States, if the estimated annual rental is more than \$25,000.

(3) A lease of real property owned by the United States, if the estimated annual rental is more than \$25,000.

(4) A transfer of real property owned by the United States to another Federal agency or another military department or to a State, if the estimated value is more than \$25,000.

(5) A report of excess real property owned by the United States to a disposal agency, if the estimated value is more than \$25,000.

If a transaction covered by clause (1) or (2) is part of a project, the agreement must be based on the general plan for that project, including an estimate of the total cost of the lands to be acquired or leases to be made.

(b) The Secretary of each military department shall report quarterly to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on transactions described in subsection (a)

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

that involve an estimated value of more than \$5,000 but not more than \$25,000.

(c) This section applies only to real property in the United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. It does not apply to real property for river and harbor projects or flood-control projects, or to leases of Government-owned real property for agricultural or grazing purposes.

(d) A statement in an instrument of conveyance, including a lease, that the requirements of this section have been met, or that the conveyance is not subject to this section, is conclusive.

Analysis of Chapter 159, Title 10, United States Code

Chapter 159.—Real Property; Related Personal Property; and Lease of Non-Excess Property

Sec.

- 2661. Planning and construction of public works projects by military departments.
- 2662. Real property transactions: agreement with Armed Services Committees; reports.
- 2663. Acquisition.
- 2664. Acquisition of property for lumber production.
- 2665. Sale of certain interests in land; logs.
- 2666. Acquisition: land purchase contracts; limitation on commission.
- 2667. Leases: non-excess property.
- 2668. Easements for rights-of-way.
- 2669. Easements for rights-of-way: gas, water, sewer pipe lines.
- 2670. Licenses: military installations; erection and use of buildings; American National Red Cross.

(b) The analysis of chapter 159, Title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the following item:

“2662. Real property transactions: agreement with Armed Services Committees; reports.”

The Act of August 10, 1956 (70A Stat. 636)

(Sec. 43:)

(a) The Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, or his designee, must come to an agreement with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives

(c) Section 43 of the Act of August 10, 1956 (70A Stat. 636), is repealed.

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

before entering into any of the following transactions by or for the use of that administration:

(1) An acquisition of fee title to any real property, if the estimated price is more than \$25,000.

(2) A lease of any real property to the United States, if the estimated annual rental is more than \$25,000.

(3) A lease of real property owned by the United States, if the estimated annual rental is more than \$25,000.

(4) A transfer of real property owned by the United States to another Federal agency or to a State, if the estimated value is more than \$25,000.

(5) A report of excess real property owned by the United States to a disposal agency, if the estimated value is more than \$25,000.

If a transaction covered by clause (1) or (2) is part of a project, the agreement must be based on the general plan for that project, including an estimate of the total cost of the lands to be acquired or leases to be made.

(b) The Administrator shall report quarterly to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on transactions described in subsection (a) that involve an estimated value of more than \$5,000 but not more than \$25,000.

(c) This section applies only to real property in the United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. It does not apply to real property for river and harbor projects or flood-control projects, or to leases of Government-owned real property for agricultural or grazing purposes.

(d) A statement in an instrument of conveyance, including a lease, that the requirements of this section have been met, or that the conveyance is not subject to this section, is conclusive.

In addition to the foregoing, the bill also provides additional monetary authorization to correct deficiencies in authorization for certain projects authorized under previous Military Construction Acts. There follows a listing by individual project and Public Law of the amounts previously authorized and the amounts as changed by the bill:

Public Law	Section	Installation	Exlstng amount authorized	As amended by bill	Section of bill
Public Law 209, 83d Cong.....	101	Pueblo Ordnance Depot, Colo.	\$563,000	\$600,000	105
Public Law 161, 84th Cong.....	101	Redstone Arsenal, Ala.....	2,865,000	4,180,000	106
Do.....	101	Fort Monmouth, N. J.....	615,000	731,000	106
Do.....	101	Vint Hill Farms Station, Va.	695,000	1,022,000	106
Do.....	101	Granite City Engineer Depot, Ill.	1,822,000	2,815,000	106
Do.....	¹ 101	Walter Reed Army Medical Center, D. C.	4,472,000	6,714,000	106
Do.....	101	Fort George G. Meade, Md.	923,000	1,264,000	106
Do.....	101	Fort Bliss, Tex.....	4,645,000	4,965,000	106
Do.....	101	Fort Sill, Okla.....	3,053,000	3,454,000	106
Do.....	101	Fort Ord, Calif.....	1,407,000	1,742,000	106
Do.....	101	U. S. Military Academy, N. Y.	756,000	1,171,000	106
Public Law 968, 84th Cong....	101	White Sands Proving Grounds, N. Mex.	693,000	735,000	107
Do.....	101	Camp Detrick, Md.....	913,000	1,074,000	107
Do.....	101	Dugway Proving Ground, Utah.	867,000	1,044,000	107
Do.....	101	Fort Huachuca, Ariz.....	6,856,000	7,576,000	107
Do.....	101	Fort Belvoir, Va.....	492,000	940,000	107
Do.....	101	Fort Eustis, Va.....	1,231,000	1,436,000	107
Do.....	101	Fort Dix, N. J.....	54,000	68,000	107
Do.....	101	Fort George G. Meade, Md.	5,885,000	7,695,000	107
Do.....	101	Fort Benning, Ga.....	422,000	616,000	107
Do.....	101	Fort McClellan, Ala.....	397,000	527,000	107
Do.....	101	Fort Hood, Tex.....	2,457,000	2,846,000	107
Do.....	101	Fort Riley, Kans.....	1,519,000	1,892,000	107
Do.....	101	Fort Lewis, Wash.....	3,022,000	3,596,000	107
Do.....	101	Fort Ord, Calif.....	223,000	319,000	107
Do.....	101	Wildwood Station, Kenai (Alaska area).	352,000	516,000	107
Public Law 85-241.....	101	Cold Regions Laboratory, New Hampshire.	2,496,000	3,787,000	108
Public Law 534, 82d Cong.....	201	Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Va.	12,815,000	13,979,000	205
Public Law 534, 83d Cong.....	¹ 202	Classified installations.....	70,656,000	72,785,000	206
Public Law 161, 84th Cong....	201	Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif.	648,000	778,000	207
Do.....	201	Naval Underwater Ordnance Station, Newport, R. I.	370,000	411,000	207
Do.....	201	Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam.	6,525,000	9,006,000	207
Do.....	201	Naval Station, Argentia, Newfoundland.	8,589,800	9,089,800	207
Public Law 968, 84th Cong....	201	Naval Station, Newport, R. I.	11,672,000	14,601,000	208
Do.....	201	Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Tex.	2,247,000	2,569,000	208
Do.....	201	Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Miss.	8,231,000	9,141,000	208
Do.....	201	Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C.	170,000	273,000	208
Do.....	201	Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Va.	237,000	300,000	208
Do.....	201	Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.	8,413,000	10,613,000	208
Do.....	201	Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Ill.	12,730,000	14,754,000	208
Do.....	¹ 203	Classified installations.....	85,939,000	86,711,000	208
Public Law 161, 84th Cong....	301	Otis Air Force Base, Mass.	6,076,000	6,522,000	305
Do.....	¹ 301	Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.	14,508,000	15,800,000	305
Public Law 968, 84th Cong....	¹ 301	Duluth Municipal Airport, Minn.	1,469,000	1,636,000	306
Do.....	301	Otis Air Force Base, Mass.	11,577,000	13,341,000	306
Do.....	301	Hill Air Force Base, Utah.	1,339,000	1,661,000	306
Do.....	301	James Connally Air Force Base, Tex.	4,687,000	5,301,000	306
Do.....	¹ 301	Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont.	1,586,000	1,726,000	306

¹ As amended by Public Law 85-241.

Public Law	Section	Installation	Existing amount authorized	As amended by bill	Section of bill
Public Law 85-241-----	301	Glasgow Air Force Base, Mont.	\$2,048,000	\$2,390,000	307
Do-----	301	Grandview Air Force Base, Mo.	1,100,000	1,348,000	307
Do-----	301	Minot Air Force Base, N. Dak.	6,804,000	8,507,000	307
Do-----	301	Otis Air Force Base, Mass.	559,000	615,000	307
Do-----	301	Kelly Air Force Base, Tex.	899,000	1,128,000	307
Do-----	301	Perrin Air Force Base, Tex.	460,000	627,000	307
Do-----	301	Barksdale Air Force Base, La.	3,344,000	3,633,000	307
Do-----	301	Beale Air Force Base, Calif.	7,458,000	9,087,000	307
Do-----	301	MacDill Air Force Base, Fla.	936,000	1,268,000	307
Do-----	301	Portsmouth Air Force Base, N. H.	2,344,000	2,947,000	307
Do-----	301	Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo.	235,000	306,000	307
Public Law 85-325-----	21	Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak.	895,000	1,892,000	308
Do-----	21	Minot Air Force Base, N. Dak.	867,000	1,479,000	308
Do-----	21	Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho.	4,380,000	5,479,000	308
Do-----	21	Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr.	690,000	969,000	308

* Under the heading "Alert and Dispersal of Strategic Air Command Forces."

The above increases in monetary authorization for projects authorized by prior Military Construction Acts require the following changes to be made in the General Provisions of such Acts as follows:

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

The Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606) (Public Law 534, 82d Congress), as amended

(Sec. 402:)

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, but not to exceed—

(2) for public works authorized by title II: Inside continental United States, \$139,143,000; outside continental United States, \$32,295,000; classified facilities, \$95,489,000; or a total of \$266,927,000;

(Sec. 205 (b):)

Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$139,143,000" and "\$266,927,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$140,307,000", and "\$268,091,000".

The Act of August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 440) (Public Law 209, 83d Congress), as amended

(Sec. 502:)

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to

(Sec. 105 (b):)

Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

accomplish the purposes of this Act, but not to exceed—

(1) for public works authorized by title I: Inside continental United States, \$44,407,000; outside continental United States, \$20,560,000; classified facilities, \$69,108,000; or a total of \$134,075,000;

The Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535) (Public Law 534, 83d Congress), as amended

(Sec. 502:)

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, but not to exceed—

(2) for public works authorized by title II: Inside continental United States, \$103,555,000; outside continental United States, \$36,493,000; classified installations and facilities, \$70,656,000; or a total of \$210,704,000;

The Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324) (Public Law 161, 84th Congress), as amended

(Sec. 502:)

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, but not to exceed—

(1) for public works authorized by title I: Inside continental United States, \$237,320,000; outside continental United States, \$75,074,000; section 102, \$223,993,000; section 103, \$10,000,000; or a total of \$546,387,000;

section 502 the amounts “\$44,407,000” and “\$134,075,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$44,444,000” and “\$134,112,000”, respectively.

(Sec. 206(b):)

Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts “\$70,656,000”, and “\$210,704,000” and inserting respectively in place thereof “\$72,785,000”, and “\$212,833,000”.

(Sec. 106 (b):)

Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts “\$237,320,000” and “\$546,387,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$244,125,000” and “\$553,192,000”, respectively.

EXISTING LAW

(2) for public works authorized by title II: Inside continental United State, \$308,463,000; outside continental United States, \$108,365,000; section 202, \$152,763,000; section 203, \$6,000,000; or a total of \$575,592,300;

(3) for public works authorized by title III: Inside continental United States, \$824,300,000; outside continental United States, \$533,539,000; section 302, \$5,000,000; section 303, \$350,000; or a total of \$1,363,189,000; and

(4) for public works authorized by title IV; \$54,500,000

The Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991) (Public Law 968, 84th Cong.), as amended.

(Sec. 402:)

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, and III shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$95,010,000; outside the United States, \$35,763,000; section 102, \$203,331,000; or a total of \$334,104,000;

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$303,453,000; outside the United States, \$62,001,000; section 203, \$85,939,000; or a total of \$451,393,000;

THE BILL

(Sec. 207 (c):)

Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts “308,463,600”, “\$108,365,000”, and \$575,592,300” and inserting respectively in place thereof “\$308,634,600”, “\$111,403,300”, and \$578,801,300”.

(Sec. 305 (b):)

Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts “\$824,300,000” and “\$1,363,189,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$826,038,000” and “\$1,364,927,000”, respectively.

(Sec. 107 (c):)

Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 402 the amounts “\$95,010,000”, “\$35,763,000”, and “\$334,104,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$100,343,000”, “\$35,927,000”, and “\$339,601,000”, respectively.

(Sec. 208 (c):)

Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts “\$303,453,000”, “\$85,939,000”, and “\$451,393,000” and inserting respectively in place thereof “\$312,004,000”, “\$86,711,000”, and “\$460,706,000”.

EXISTING LAW

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$811,342,000; outside the United States \$423,608,000; section 302 (a), \$163,000,000; section 302 (b), \$50,000,000 or a total of \$1,447,950,000.

The Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531) (Public Law 85-241)

(Sec. 502:)

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations, for public works projects authorized by Title I, II, and III shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$115,624,000; outside the United States, \$34,477,000; section 102, \$143,002,000; or a total of \$293,103,000;

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$394,076,000; outside the United States, \$160,705,000; section 302, \$47,000,000; or a total of \$601,781,000.

The Act of February 12, 1958 (72 Stat. 11) (Public Law 85-325)

(Sec. 3:)

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of sections 1 and 2 of this Act but appropriations for public works projects authorized by those sections may not exceed \$549,670,000.

THE BILL

(Sec. 306 (b):)

Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the amounts "\$811,342,000" and "\$1,447,950,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$814,349,000" and "\$1,450,957,000", respectively.

(Sec. 108 (b):)

Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$115,624,000" and "\$293,103,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$116,915,000" and "\$294,394,000."

(Sec. 307 (b):)

Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "\$394,076,000" and "\$601,781,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$399,755,000" and "\$607,460,000", respectively.

(Sec. 308 (b):)

Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended by striking out in section 3 the amount "\$549,670,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$552,657,000".

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

Title 10, United States Code

Sec. 2233. Acquisition.

(a) Subject to sections 2234, 2235, 2236, and 2238 of this title and subsection (c) of this section and after consulting the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Defense may—

(1) acquire by purchase, lease, or transfer, and construct, expand, rehabilitate, or convert and equip, such facilities as he determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter;

(2) contribute to any State or Territory, Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia such amounts as he determines to be necessary to expand, rehabilitate, or convert facilities owned by it for use jointly by units of two or more of the reserve components of the armed forces;

(3) contribute to any State or Territory, Puerto Rico or the District of Columbia such amounts as he determines to be necessary to expand, rehabilitate, or convert facilities owned by it (or to acquire, construct, expand, rehabilitate, or convert additional facilities) made necessary by the conversion, redesignation, or reorganization of units of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States authorized by the Secretary of the military department concerned; and

(4) contribute to any State or Territory, Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia such amounts for the acquisition, construction, expansion, rehabilitation, or conversion by it of additional facilities as he

(SEC. 601:)

(1) That part of section 2233 (a) that precedes clause (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 2233. Acquisition

“(a) Subject to sections 2233a, 2234, 2235, and 2238 of this title and subsection (c) of this section, the Secretary of Defense may—”

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

determines to be required by an increase in the strength of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States.

(b) Title to property acquired under subsection (a) (1) vested in the United States.

(c) The Secretary of Defense may delegate any of his authority or functions under this chapter to any department, agency, or officer of the Department of Defense.

(d) The expenses of leasing property under subsection (a) (1) may be paid from appropriations available for the payment of rent.

(Sec. 601:)

(2) Section 2233 is amended by adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

“(e) The Secretary of Defense may procure advance planning, construction design, and architectural services in connection with facilities to be established or developed under this chapter which are not otherwise authorized by law.”

“(f) Facilities authorized by subsection (a) shall not be considered ‘military public works’ under the provisions of the military construction authorization acts that repeal prior authorizations for military public works.”

(Subsec. (d), which was added by sec. 414 of the act of August 3, 1956, has not yet been codified, but its inclusion in the code is provided by sec. 1 (39) of H. R. 8943, 85th Cong.)

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

National Defense Facilities Act of
1950

SEC. 3. Subject to the provisions of section 4 of this Act, the Secretary of Defense may, in an amount not to exceed \$580,000,000 over a period of the next eight fiscal years commencing with fiscal year 1951, after consultation with the respective Armed Services Committees of the Congress—

(a) acquire by purchase, lease, or transfer, construct, expand, rehabilitate, convert, and equip such facilities as he shall determine to be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this chapter, except that expenditures for the leasing of property for such purposes may be made from appropriations otherwise available for the payment of rentals and without regard to the monetary limitation otherwise imposed by this section;

(Sec. 3 of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended, has been codified as sec. 2233 of title 10, United States Code, to the extent that it was permanent law. The above amendment deletes time and money limitations which were not codified.)

SEC. 602. (a) Section 3 of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended by paragraph (a) of the Act of August 9, 1955, chapter 662 (69 Stat. 593), and by section 2 of the Act of August 29, 1957, Public Law 85-215 (71 Stat. 489), is amended by striking out the words "in an amount not to exceed \$580,000,000 over a period of the next eight fiscal years commencing with fiscal year 1951,".

SEC. 602. (b) Section 3 (a) of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended by section 414 of the Act of August 3, 1956, chapter 939 (70 Stat. 1018), is amended by striking out the words "and without regard to the monetary limitation otherwise imposed by this section".

SUMMARY OF MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS AND RESERVE FACILITIES
FOR FISCAL YEAR 1959

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Alabama	\$16, 132, 000
Army:	
Redstone Arsenal	8, 529, 000
Fort McClellan	3, 505, 000
Fort Rucker	2, 406, 000
Air Force:	
Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile	975, 000
Craig Air Force Base, Selma	400, 000
Army National Guard: Ashford	70, 000
Air Force Reserve: Bates Field, Mobile	97, 000
Air National Guard: Birmingham Municipal Airport	150, 000
Arizona	15, 902, 000
Army:	
Fort Huachuca	9, 098, 000
Yuma Test Station	173, 000
Air Force:	
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson	4, 174, 000
Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix	441, 000
Williams Air Force Base, Chandler	1, 361, 000
Air National Guard: Sky Harbor Airport, Phoenix	655, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Arkansas.....	\$5, 162, 000
<hr/>	
Air Force:	
Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville.....	1, 654, 000
Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock.....	3, 463, 000
Army National Guard: Berryville.....	45, 000
<hr/>	
California.....	91, 208, 000
<hr/>	
Army:	
Baywood Park.....	144, 000
Fort Ord.....	4, 733, 000
Navy:	
Naval Air Station, Alameda.....	114, 000
Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow.....	280, 000
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton.....	5, 138, 000
Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake.....	129, 000
Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord.....	2, 517, 000
Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona.....	510, 000
Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing.....	47, 000
Naval Air Station, Lemoore.....	15, 823, 000
Naval Shipyard, Long Beach.....	6, 000, 000
Naval Air Station, North Island.....	7, 000, 000
Naval Supply Center, Oakland.....	146, 000
Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu.....	13, 841, 000
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego.....	206, 000
Naval Training Center, San Diego.....	4, 199, 000
Naval Shipyard, San Francisco.....	766, 000
Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana.....	2, 158, 000
Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms.....	241, 000
Air Force:	
Beale Air Force Base, Marysville.....	7, 868, 000
Castle Air Force Base, Merced.....	4, 578, 000
Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc.....	981, 000
George Air Force Base, Victorville.....	536, 000
March Air Force Base, Riverside.....	3, 344, 000
Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento.....	1, 213, 000
McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento.....	1, 560, 000
Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino.....	658, 000
Oxnard Air Force Base, Oxnard.....	122, 000
Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield.....	2, 997, 000
Army National Guard: Hollister.....	105, 000
Army Reserve:	
Salinas.....	164, 000
Stockton.....	164, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve:	
Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos.....	1, 992, 000
Naval and Marine Corps Training Center, Alameda.....	128, 000
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Hayward.....	99, 000
Naval Reserve Training Center, Pasadena.....	295, 000
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Port Chicago.....	94, 000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Jose.....	78, 000
Air National Guard:	
Hayward Municipal Airport.....	113, 000
Ontario International Airport.....	127, 000
<hr/>	
Colorado.....	6, 514, 000
<hr/>	
Army: Fitzsimons Army Hospital.....	862, 000
Air Force: Lowry Air Force Base, Denver.....	5, 000, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Air Station, Denver.....	652, 000
<hr/>	

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Connecticut-----	\$2, 407, 000
Navy: Naval Submarine Base, New London-----	2, 247, 000
Air Force Reserve: Bradley Field, Windsor Locks-----	160, 000
Delaware-----	2, 874, 000
Air Force: Dover Air Force Base, Dover-----	2, 874, 000
District of Columbia-----	842, 000
Navy:	
Naval Research Laboratory-----	192, 000
Naval receiving station-----	650, 000
Florida-----	43, 253, 000
Navy:	
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field-----	1, 252, 000
Naval Air Station, Jacksonville-----	74, 000
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport-----	9, 892, 000
Naval outlying field, Whitehouse Field-----	142, 000
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field-----	4, 679, 000
Air Force:	
Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso-----	10, 109, 000
Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead-----	1, 489, 000
MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa-----	3, 577, 000
McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando-----	5, 137, 000
Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa-----	2, 884, 000
Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City-----	3, 992, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Reserve Training Center, St. Petersburg-----	26, 000
Georgia-----	18, 862, 000
Army: Fort Benning-----	3, 454, 000
Air Force:	
Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta-----	172, 000
Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah-----	4, 493, 000
Robins Air Force Base, Macon-----	4, 362, 000
Turner Air Force Base, Albany-----	5, 474, 000
Army National Guard: Calhoun-----	110, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta-----	480, 000
Air National Guard: Travis Field, Savannah-----	317, 000
Idaho-----	1, 096, 000
Air Force: Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home-----	1, 039, 000
Army National Guard: Rigby-----	57, 000
Illinois-----	4, 666, 000
Army: Rock Island Arsenal-----	570, 000
Navy: Naval Training Center, Great Lakes-----	1, 368, 000
Air Force:	
Scott Air Force Base, Belleville-----	423, 000
Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul-----	640, 000
Army Reserve: Galesburg-----	157, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve:	
Naval Air Station, Glenview-----	179, 000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Moline-----	152, 000
Air National Guard:	
Capital Airport, Springfield-----	78, 000
O'Hare International Airport, Chicago-----	1, 099, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Indiana-----	\$12, 236, 000
Army: Fort Benjamin Harrison-----	783, 000
Air Force: Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru-----	7, 996, 000
Army National Guard: Valparaiso-----	188, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Bloomington-----	95, 000
Air Force Reserve: Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus-----	3, 174, 000
Iowa-----	270, 000
Army National Guard: Camp Dodge-----	120, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Iowa City-----	97, 000
Air National Guard: Des Moines Municipal Airport-----	53, 000
Kansas-----	9, 904, 000
Army:	
Fort Leavenworth-----	1, 076, 000
Fort Riley-----	1, 084, 000
Air Force:	
Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka-----	2, 703, 000
McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita-----	2, 119, 000
Schilling Air Force Base, Salina-----	2, 352, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Air Station, Olathe-----	570, 000
Kentucky-----	2, 292, 000
Army:	
Fort Knox-----	516, 000
Fort Campbell-----	847, 000
Army National Guard: Middleboro-----	130, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Danville-----	84, 000
Air National Guard: Standiford Field, Louisville-----	715, 000
Louisiana-----	11, 285, 000
Air Force:	
Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport-----	4, 280, 000
Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles-----	3, 401, 000
Army National Guard: Camp Beauregard-----	325, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve:	
Naval Air Station (Alvin Callender), New Orleans-----	2, 447, 000
Communications Facility, New Orleans-----	210, 000
Air Force Reserve: Naval Air Station (Alvin Callender), New Orleans-----	622, 000
Maine-----	56, 489, 000
Navy: Naval Radio Station, Washington County-----	38, 654, 000
Air Force:	
Brunswick Naval Air Station, Brunswick-----	11, 417, 000
Dow Air Force Base, Bangor-----	2, 404, 000
Loring Air Force Base, Limestone-----	3, 774, 000
Army National Guard:	
South Portland-----	150, 000
Augusta-----	90, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Maryland-----	\$68,590,000
Army:	
Aberdeen Proving Ground-----	2,697,000
Army Chemical Center-----	2,051,000
Army Map Service-----	1,913,000
Fort Detrick-----	795,000
Fort Meade-----	498,000
Fort Ritchie-----	43,000
Navy:	
Naval Air Facility, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs-----	17,666,000
Naval Academy, Annapolis-----	14,200,000
National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda-----	8,503,000
Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak-----	601,000
Air Force: Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs-----	18,937,000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Reserve Training Center, White Oak-----	557,000
Air Force Reserve: Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs--	129,000
Massachusetts-----	7,659,000
Army: Fort Devens-----	171,000
Navy: Naval Ammunition Depot, Hingham-----	694,000
Air Force:	
Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford-----	165,000
Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth-----	3,689,000
Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls-----	1,345,000
Army National Guard:	
Agawam-----	170,000
Whitman-----	170,000
Naval and Marine Reserve:	
Naval Air Station, South Weymouth-----	407,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Boston-----	108,000
Air National Guard: Barnes Field, Westfield-----	740,000
Michigan-----	40,236,000
Army: Detroit Arsenal-----	5,666,000
Air Force:	
Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie-----	9,948,000
K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette-----	10,673,000
Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens-----	3,579,000
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda-----	8,696,000
Army National Guard: Sturgis-----	220,000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile-----	147,000
Air National Guard:	
Alpena County Airport, Alpena-----	171,000
Kellogg Field, Battle Creek-----	1,136,000
Minnesota-----	3,279,000
Air Force: Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth-----	2,649,000
Army National Guard: Northwest St. Paul-----	130,000
Air National Guard: Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel--	500,000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Mississippi-----	\$17, 503, 000
Navy: Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian-----	14, 940, 000
Air Force:	
Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus-----	1, 939, 000
Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville-----	208, 000
Army National Guard: Ackerman-----	54, 000
Air National Guard: Gulfport Municipal Airport, Gulfport--	362, 000
Missouri-----	8, 208, 000
Air Force:	
Richard Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City-----	2, 799, 000
Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster-----	5, 185, 000
Air Force Reserve: Richards Gebaur Air Force Base, Belton--	101, 000
Air National Guard: Rosecrans Field, St. Joseph-----	123, 000
Montana-----	12, 558, 000
Air Force:	
Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow-----	10, 659, 000
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls-----	1, 832, 000
Army National Guard: Kalispell-----	67, 000
Nebraska-----	7, 515, 000
Air Force:	
Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln-----	4, 250, 000
Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha-----	3, 265, 000
Nevada-----	4, 170, 000
Army: Camp Desert Rock-----	2, 892, 000
Navy: Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon-----	80, 000
Air Force:	
Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas-----	358, 000
Stead Air Force Base, Reno-----	571, 000
Air National Guard: Hubbard Field, Reno-----	159, 000
Army National Guard: Winnemucca-----	110, 000
New Hampshire-----	1, 435, 000
Air Force: Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth-----	940, 000
Army National Guard: Concord-----	145, 000
Air Force Reserve: Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester-----	180, 000
Air National Guard: Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester---	170, 000
New Jersey-----	8, 046, 000
Army: Fort Dix-----	3, 749, 000
Navy: Naval Facility, Cape May-----	141, 000
Air Force: McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown-----	3, 901, 000
Army National Guard:	
Pitman-----	175, 000
Trenton-----	80, 000
New Mexico-----	19, 120, 000
Army: White Sands Proving Ground-----	7, 931, 000
Air Force:	
Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo-----	1, 650, 000
Walker Air Force Base, Roswell-----	8, 431, 000
Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque-----	481, 000
Army National Guard: Espanola-----	57, 000
Air National Guard: Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque--	570, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

New York-----	\$9, 474, 000
Army: United States Military Academy-----	5, 844, 000
Air Force:	
Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome-----	1, 177, 000
Plattsburg Air Force Base, Plattsburg-----	208, 000
Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton-----	86, 000
Army National Guard: Saranac Lake-----	300, 000
Army Reserve:	
Batavia-----	171, 000
Canandaigua-----	171, 000
Hempstead-----	536, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve:	
Naval Air Station, New York-----	130, 000
Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls-----	652, 000
Naval Reserve Training Center, Dunkirk-----	79, 000
Naval Reserve Training Center, Fort Schuyler-----	120, 000
North Carolina-----	19, 098, 000
Army: Fort Bragg-----	762, 000
Navy:	
Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point-----	11, 215, 000
Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point-----	1, 067, 000
Marine Corps Air Facility, New River-----	1, 003, 000
Air Force: Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro-----	4, 858, 000
Army National Guard:	
Shallotte-----	95, 000
Smithfield-----	98, 000
North Dakota-----	7, 046, 000
Air Force:	
Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks-----	4, 176, 000
Minot Air Force Base, Minot-----	2, 721, 000
Army Reserve: Fargo-----	149, 000
Ohio-----	35, 222, 000
Air Force:	
Clinton County, Air Force Base, Wilmington-----	11, 589, 000
Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus-----	11, 716, 000
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton-----	11, 037, 000
Army National Guard: Caldwell-----	135, 000
Army Reserve:	
Fremont-----	149, 000
St. Marys-----	149, 000
Canton-----	40, 000
Warren-----	289, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve:	
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Chillicothe-----	100, 000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Steubenville-----	18, 000
Oklahoma-----	17, 887, 000
Army: Fort Sill-----	3, 227, 000
Air Force:	
Altus Air Force Base, Altus-----	4, 051, 000
Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton-----	2, 734, 000
Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City-----	5, 196, 000
Vance Air Force Base, Enid-----	1, 770, 000
Army Reserve:	
Durant-----	141, 000
Oklahoma City-----	443, 000
Air Force Reserve: Davis Field, Muskogee-----	325, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Oregon-----	\$462, 000
Air Force: Kingsley Air Force Base, Klamath-----	229, 000
Air National Guard: Portland International Airport-----	233, 000
Pennsylvania-----	9, 183, 000
Army: Carlisle Barracks-----	2, 274, 000
Air Force:	
Olmstead Air Force Base, Middletown-----	6, 169, 000
Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta-----	94, 000
Army National Guard: Chester-----	206, 000
Army Reserve:	
Johnstown-----	99, 000
St. Marys-----	149, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Air Station, Willow Grove--	99, 000
Air Force Reserve: Naval Air Station, Willow Grove-----	93, 000
Rhode Island-----	4, 405, 000
Navy:	
Naval Station, Newport-----	1, 709, 000
Naval Supply Depot, Newport-----	2, 210, 000
Naval War College, Newport-----	273, 000
Air National Guard: Theodore F. Green Airport, Providence--	213, 000
South Carolina-----	18, 187, 000
Navy:	
Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort-----	4, 352, 000
Naval Shipyard, Charleston-----	10, 000, 000
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island-----	462, 000
Air Force:	
Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville-----	78, 000
Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach-----	1, 650, 000
Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter-----	1, 339, 000
Army National Guard:	
Belton-----	122, 000
Whitmire-----	99, 000
Army Reserve: Greenwood-----	85, 000
South Dakota-----	3, 391, 000
Air Force: Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City-----	3, 241, 000
Air National Guard: Salem-----	150, 000
Tennessee-----	2, 599, 000
Air Force:	
Memphis General Depot, Memphis-----	1, 464, 000
Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna-----	591, 000
Army National Guard: Livingston-----	91, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Memphis-----	453, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Texas-----	\$54, 040, 000
Army:	
Fort Bliss-----	13, 734, 000
Fort Hood-----	4, 258, 000
Navy: Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville-----	1, 041, 000
Air Force:	
Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo-----	979, 000
Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin-----	1, 584, 000
Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso-----	5, 080, 000
Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio-----	13, 805, 000
Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth-----	2, 257, 000
Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene-----	1, 346, 000
James Connally Air Force Base, Waco-----	750, 000
Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio-----	157, 000
Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio-----	897, 000
Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman-----	319, 000
Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio-----	245, 000
Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls-----	2, 051, 000
Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring-----	3, 081, 000
Army National Guard:	
Gainesville-----	111, 000
Honey Grove-----	90, 000
Army Reserve: Sinton-----	134, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Air Station, Dallas-----	259, 000
Air National Guard: Hensley Field, Grand Prairie-----	1, 862, 000
Utah-----	1, 746, 000
Air Force: Hill Air Force Base, Ogden-----	1, 746, 000
Vermont-----	1, 335, 000
Air Force: Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski-----	990, 000
Army National Guard:	
Swanton-----	137, 000
Burlington-----	208, 000
Virginia-----	19, 063, 000
Army:	
Fort Lee-----	4, 630, 000
Fort Eustis-----	3, 634, 000
Navy:	
Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren-----	44, 000
Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia Beach-----	1, 184, 000
Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Fentress-----	142, 000
Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk-----	4, 643, 000
Naval Base, Norfolk-----	2, 546, 000
Naval Supply Center, Norfolk-----	128, 000
Marine Corps School, Quantico-----	168, 000
Air Force: Langley Air Force Base, Hampton-----	1, 371, 000
Army National Guard: Berryville-----	135, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Lynchburg-----	388, 000
Air National Guard: Byrd Field, Richmond-----	50, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Washington.....	\$11, 479, 000
Army: Fort Lewis.....	1, 085, 000
Navy: Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor.....	86, 000
Air Force:	
Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane.....	4, 094, 000
Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake.....	3, 795, 000
McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma.....	935, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve:	
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Centralia.....	81, 000
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Olympia (Tum- water).....	47, 000
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Yakima.....	48, 000
Air National Guard: Geiger Field, Spokane.....	1, 308, 000
West Virginia.....	761, 000
Army National Guard: Beckley.....	200, 000
Army Reserve:	
Beckley.....	289, 000
Weirton.....	149, 000
Air National Guard: Martinsburg Municipal Airport, Mar- tinsburg.....	123, 000
Wisconsin.....	17, 903, 000
Air Force:	
Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville.....	15, 552, 000
Truax Field, Madison.....	795, 000
Army Reserve:	
Beloit.....	157, 000
Kewaunee.....	157, 000
Madison.....	490, 000
Air Force Reserve: General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee.....	173, 000
Air National Guard: Camp Williams, Camp Douglas.....	579, 000
Wyoming.....	291, 000
Army National Guard: Lovell.....	142, 000
Army Reserve: Cheyenne.....	149, 000
Various locations (Zone of Interior).....	170, 932, 000
Army.....	6, 584, 000
Air Force.....	163, 629, 000
Air National Guard.....	300, 000
Army Reserve.....	419, 000
Classified (Zone of Interior).....	484, 495, 000
Army.....	123, 199, 000
Navy.....	73, 796, 000
Air Force.....	287, 500, 000

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Alaska-----	\$2, 194, 000
Army: Fairbanks-----	7, 000
Air Force:	
Eielson Air Force Base-----	380, 000
Elmendorf Air Force Base-----	710, 000
King Salmon Airport-----	340, 000
Army National Guard:	
Bethel-----	480, 000
Fairbanks-----	277, 000
Bermuda-----	683, 000
Navy: Naval station-----	683, 000
Canal Zone-----	1, 540, 000
Air Force: Howard Air Force Base-----	1, 540, 000
Cuba-----	890, 000
Navy: Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay-----	890, 000
Eritrea-----	1, 180, 000
Navy: Naval Communication Unit No. 3-----	1, 180, 000
Hawaii-----	5, 847, 000
Army:	
Kawaihae Harbor-----	240, 000
Schofield Barracks-----	593, 000
Fort Shafter-----	2, 925, 000
Navy:	
Naval Air Station, Ford Island-----	1, 271, 000
Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor-----	159, 000
Air Force: Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu-----	144, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval and Marine Reserve Train- ing Center, Honolulu-----	515, 000
Mariana Islands-----	8, 982, 000
Navy:	
Naval Air Station, Agana-----	4, 414, 000
Naval Supply Depot, Guam-----	3, 060, 000
Air Force: Andersen Air Force Base-----	1, 508, 000
Midway-----	839, 000
Air Force: Naval Station, Midway Island-----	839, 000
Morocco-----	519, 000
Navy: Naval Radio Facility, Port Lyautey-----	519, 000
North Ireland-----	219, 000
Navy: Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry-----	219, 000
Okinawa-----	165, 000
Navy: Naval Air Facility, Naha-----	165, 000

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Puerto Rico-----	\$4, 735, 000
Navy: Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads-----	3, 824, 000
Air Force: Ramey Air Force Base-----	643, 000
Army National Guard:	
Juncos-----	38, 000
Mayaguez-----	160, 000
Air National Guard: San Juan International Airport, San Juan-----	70, 000
Various locations, overseas-----	122, 517, 000
Army-----	4, 967, 000
Air Force-----	117, 550, 000
Classified locations, overseas-----	79, 427, 000
Army-----	77, 922, 000
Navy-----	1, 505, 000
Locations not specified-----	80, 000, 000
Army-----	10, 000, 000
Navy-----	10, 000, 000
Air Force-----	10, 000, 000
Department of Defense-----	50, 000, 000



85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

[Report No. 1957]

JUNE 18, 1958

JUNE 24, 1958

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in *italic*]

I

1 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

2 TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

3 (Ordnance Corps)

4 Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing,
5 and utilities, \$2,697,000.

6 Detroit Arsenal, Michigan: Administrative facilities,
7 \$5,666,000.

8 Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Administrative facilities,
9 troop housing, and utilities, \$8,529,000.

10 Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois: Operational and training
11 facilities, \$570,000.

12 White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico: Operational
13 and training facilities, research, development and test facili-
14 ties, medical facilities, troop housing, and community
15 facilities, \$7,931,000.

16 (Quartermaster Corps)

17 Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational and training facilities,
18 and troop housing, \$4,630,000.

19 (Chemical Corps)

20 Army Chemical Center, Maryland: Troop housing, and
21 utilities, \$2,051,000.

22 Fort Detrick, Maryland: Troop housing, ~~\$1,795,000~~
23 \$795,000.

24 (Signal Corps)

25 Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, re-
26 search, development, and test facilities, administrative fa-

1 cilities, troop housing, operational and training facilities, and
2 utilities, \$9,098,000.

3 (Corps of Engineers)

4 Army Map Service, Maryland: Operational and train-
5 ing facilities, \$1,913,000.

6 (Transportation Corps)

7 Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational and training facili-
8 ties, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities,
9 \$3,634,000.

10 (Medical Corps)

11 Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Troop housing,
12 \$862,000.

13 FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

14 (First Army Area)

15 Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational and training
16 facilities, \$171,000.

17 Fort Dix, New Jersey: Troop housing and utilities,
18 \$3,749,000.

19 (Second Army Area)

20 Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: Hospital facilities,
21 family housing, and real estate, \$2,274,000.

22 Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational and training facili-
23 ties, and utilities, \$516,000.

24 Fort Meade, Maryland: Operational and training facili-
25 ties, \$498,000.

1 Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Supply facilities, \$43,000.

2 (Third Army Area)

3 Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational and training facili-
4 ties, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and family hous-
5 ing, \$3,454,000.

6 Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and training
7 facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$762,000.

8 Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational and training fa-
9 cilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and admin-
10 istrative facilities, \$847,000.

11 Fort McClellan, Alabama: Operational and training
12 facilities, and hospital facilities, \$3,505,000.

13 Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facili-
14 ties, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities,
15 \$2,406,000.

16 (Fourth Army Area)

17 Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities,
18 maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$13,734,-
19 000.

20 Fort Hood, Texas: Operational and training facilities,
21 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
22 ties, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,258,000.

1 Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities,
2 maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities,
3 \$3,227,000.

4 (Fifth Army Area)

5 Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Troop housing, and
6 family housing, \$783,000.

7 Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Operational and training
8 facilities, and troop housing, \$1,076,000.

9 Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational and training facilities,
10 and utilities, \$1,084,000.

11 (Sixth Army Area)

12 Baywood Park, California: Real estate, \$144,000.

13 Camp Desert Rock, Nevada: Maintenance facilities,
14 troop housing, and utilities, \$2,892,000.

15 Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational and training
16 facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,085,000.

17 Fort Ord, California: Operational and training facilities,
18 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-
19 munity facilities, and utilities, \$4,733,000.

20 Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Operational and training
21 facilities, \$173,000.

1 (Military Academy)

2 United States Military Academy, West Point, New
3 York: Troop housing, medical facilities, and community
4 facilities, \$5,844,000.

5 (Armed Forces Special Weapons)

6 Various locations: Maintenance facilities, community
7 facilities, and utilities, \$273,000.

8 (Tactical Installations Support Facilities)

9 Various locations: Maintenance facilities, \$6,311,000.

10 OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

11 (Alaskan Area)

12 Fairbanks Permafrost Research Area: Real estate,
13 \$7,000.

14 (Pacific Command Area)

15 Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: Operational and training fa-
16 cilities, \$240,000.

17 Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Troop housing, \$593,000.

18 Fort Shafter, Hawaii: Supply facilities, maintenance
19 facilities, family housing, and community facilities, \$2,-
20 925,000.

21 Korea: Operational and training facilities, supply facili-
22 ties, and utilities, \$904,000.

(United States Army, Europe)

France: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,063,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$201,121,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in

1 the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Sec-
2 retary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Com-
3 mittees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of
4 Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision
5 to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work
6 undertaken under this section, including those real estate
7 actions pertaining thereto.

8 SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of
9 section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119,
10 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized
11 to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing
12 for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations
13 by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the pro-
14 visions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assist-
15 ance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other com-
16 modity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

17 Various locations, France, 298 units.

18 Vicenza, Italy, 371 units.

19 Army Security Agency, location 13, 91 units.

20 Gateway Communications Station, 174 units.

21 (b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of
22 the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as
23 amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to con-
24 struct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at
25 the following locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

- 1 Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, 316 units.
- 2 Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York, 120 units.
- 3 White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, 200 units.
- 4 Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, 130 units.
- 5 Fort Lee, Virginia, 435 units.
- 6 Natick R&E, Massachusetts, 35 units.
- 7 Fort Belvoir, Virginia, 618 units.
- 8 Two Rock Ranch Station, California, 25 units.
- 9 Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 50 units.
- 10 Beaumont Army Hospital, Texas, 125 units.
- 11 Fort Totten, New York, 130 units.
- 12 *Fort Bragg, North Carolina, 367 units.*
- 13 Fort Campbell, Kentucky, 837 units.
- 14 Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois, 65 units.
- 15 Fort Rucker, Alabama, 400 units.
- 16 Fort Stewart, Georgia, 73 units.
- 17 Fort Bliss, Texas, 410 units.
- 18 Fort Hood, Texas, 500 units.
- 19 Fort Sill, Oklahoma, 349 units.
- 20 Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 700 units.
- 21 Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, 200 units.
- 22 Fort Sheridan, Illinois, 50 units.
- 23 Forts Baker and Barry, California, 98 units.
- 24 Oakland Army Terminal, California, 88 units.

1 Fort Lewis, Washington, 856 units.

2 Branch United States Disciplinary Barracks, California,
3 160 units.

4 United States Military Academy, New York, 156 units.

5 Bossier Base, Louisiana, 200 units.

6 Fort Eustis, Virginia, 223 units.

7 Medina Base, Texas, 125 units.

8 Sandia Base, New Mexico, 213 units.

9 Army Air Defense Command Stations, 466 units.

10 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

11 Canal Zone, 330 units.

12 Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, 385 units.

13 Fort Shafter, Hawaii, 481 units: *Provided, however,*
14 That no family housing units shall be constructed on Fort
15 DeRussy.

16 (c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404
17 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as
18 amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to acquire
19 family housing at the following location:

20 Aberdeen Proving Ground, Aberdeen, Maryland, 796
21 units.

22 SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress,
23 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
24 UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows: .

1 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICE FACILI-
2 TIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Pueblo Ordnance
3 Depot, Colorado, strike out "\$563,000" and insert in place
4 thereof "\$600,000".

5 (b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as
6 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
7 tion 502 the amounts "\$44,407,000" and "\$134,075,000"
8 and inserting in place thereof "\$44,444,000" and "\$134,-
9 112,000", respectively.

10 SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
11 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
12 UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

13 (1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES
14 FACILITIES (Transportation Corps)", with respect to Point-
15 Aux-Pins Ammunition Terminal, Alabama-Mississippi, strike
16 out "Point-Aux-Pins Area Ammunition Terminal, Alabama-
17 Mississippi: Ammunition loading terminal, including acqui-
18 sition of land, \$26,951,000" and insert in place thereof
19 "Point-Aux-Pins Area Ammunition Storage Depot and Ter-
20 minal, Alabama-Mississippi: Ammunition storage depot and
21 ammunition loading terminal, including acquisition of land,
22 \$44,168,000".

23 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
24 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section

1 502 the amounts “\$131,906,000” and “\$238,870,000” and
2 inserting in place thereof “\$149,123,000” and “\$256,087,-
3 000” respectively.

4 SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-
5 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTI-
6 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

7 (1) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-
8 CILITIES (Ordnance Corps)”, with respect to Redstone
9 Arsenal, Alabama, strike out “\$2,865,000” and insert in
10 place thereof “\$4,180,000”.

11 (2) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-
12 CILITIES (Signal Corps)” with respect to Fort Monmouth,
13 New Jersey, strike out “\$615,000” and insert in place
14 thereof “\$731,000”; and with respect to Vint Hill Farms
15 Station, Virginia, strike out “\$695,000” and insert in place
16 thereof “\$1,022,000”.

17 (3) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-
18 CILITIES (Corps of Engineers)”, with respect to Granite
19 City Engineer Depot, Illinois, strike out “\$1,822,000” and
20 insert in place thereof “\$2,815,000”.

21 (4) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-
22 CILITIES (Medical Corps)”, with respect to Walter Reed
23 Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, strike out “\$4,-
24 472,000” and insert in place thereof “\$6,714,000”.

25 (5) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

1 (Second Army Area)", with respect to Fort George G.
 2 Meade, Maryland, strike out "\$923,000" and insert in place
 3 thereof "\$1,264,000".

4 (6) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
 5 (Fourth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas,
 6 strike out "\$4,645,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,-
 7 965,000"; and with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike
 8 out "\$3,053,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,454,000".

9 (7) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
 10 (Sixth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Ord, California,
 11 strike out "\$1,407,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,-
 12 742,000".

13 (8) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
 14 (Military Academy)", with respect to the United States
 15 Military Academy, New York, strike out "\$756,000" and
 16 insert in place thereof "\$1,171,000".

17 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 18 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
 19 502 the amounts "\$237,320,000" and "\$546,387,000" and
 20 inserting in place thereof "\$244,125,000" and "\$553,192,-
 21 000", respectively.

22 SEC. 108. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
 23 as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE
 24 UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

25 (1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES

1 FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to White
2 Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico, strike out "\$693,000"
3 and insert in place thereof "\$735,000".

4 (2) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES
5 FACILITIES (Chemical Corps)", with respect to Camp
6 Detrick, Maryland, strike out "\$913,000" and insert in place
7 thereof "\$1,074,000"; and with respect to Dugway Proving
8 Ground, Utah, strike out "\$867,000" and insert in place
9 thereof "\$1,044,000".

10 (3) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES
11 FACILITIES (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Hua-
12 chuca, Arizona, strike out "\$6,856,000" and insert in place
13 thereof "\$7,576,000".

14 (4) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES
15 FACILITIES (Corps of Engineers)", with respect to Fort
16 Belvoir, Virginia, strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place
17 thereof "\$940,000".

18 (5) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES
19 FACILITIES (Transportation Corps)", with respect to Fort
20 Eustis, Virginia, strike out "\$1,231,000" and insert in place
21 thereof "\$1,436,000".

22 (6) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
23 (First Army Area)", with respect to Fort Dix, New Jersey,
24 strike out "\$54,000" and insert in place thereof "\$68,000".

1 (7) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
2 (Second Army Area)", with respect to Fort George G.
3 Meade, Maryland, strike out "\$5,885,000" and insert in
4 place thereof "\$7,695,000".

5 (8) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
6 (Third Army Area)", with respect to Fort Benning,
7 Georgia, strike out "\$422,000" and insert in place thereof
8 "\$616,000"; and with respect to Fort McClellan, Alabama,
9 strike out "\$397,000" and insert in place thereof
10 "\$527,000".

11 (9) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
12 (Fourth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Hood, Texas,
13 strike out "\$2,457,000" and insert in place thereof
14 "\$2,846,000".

15 (10) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILI-
16 TIES (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Riley,
17 Kansas, strike out "\$1,519,000" and insert in place thereof
18 "\$1,892,000".

19 (11) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILI-
20 TIES (Sixth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Lewis,
21 Washington, strike out "\$3,022,000" and insert in place
22 thereof "\$3,596,000"; and with respect to Fort Ord, Cali-
23 fornia, strike out "\$223,000" and insert in place thereof
24 "\$319,000".

1 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
2 amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE
3 UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

4 Under the subheading "(Alaskan Area)", with re-
5 spect to Wildwood Station (Kenai), strike out "\$352,000"
6 and insert in place thereof "\$516,000".

7 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
8 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
9 tion 402 the amounts "\$95,010,000", "\$35,763,000", and
10 "\$334,104,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$100,-
11 343,000", "\$35,927,000", and "\$339,601,000", respec-
12 tively.

13 SEC. 109. (a) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Con-
14 gress, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED
15 STATES" in section 101 as follows:

16 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACIL-
17 ITIES (Corps of Engineers)" with respect to Cold Regions
18 Laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire, strike out "\$2,496,-
19 000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,787,000".

20 (b) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is
21 amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the
22 amounts "\$115,624,000" and "\$293,103,000" and insert-
23 ing in place thereof "\$116,915,000" and "\$294,394,000".

24 SEC. 110. The Secretary of the Army is authorized and
25 directed to enter into a contract or contracts for the sale of

1 the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Texas, and convey a clear
2 title by quitclaim deed all right, title, and interest of the
3 United States in and to said depot, to any legal person or
4 group, except Government agencies or departments, upon
5 such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be
6 in the public interest. The Secretary of the Army is directed
7 to act as follows:

8 (1) The depot shall be moved to, and integrated
9 with, the ammunition outloading terminal previously
10 authorized for construction at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala-
11 bama, and, notwithstanding any other provisions of this
12 or any other Act, the authority contained in the Act of
13 July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 536), for the acquisition of
14 land and initiation of construction for the Point-Aux-
15 Pins facility shall continue in effect until specifically
16 superseded, modified, or repealed.

17 (2) The sale of the San Jacinto Depot property
18 shall be offered by the Chief of Engineers, United States
19 Army, on behalf of and under the supervision of the
20 Secretary of the Army within eighteen months from the
21 date of this Act. No part of the land herein shall be
22 sold, transferred, or occupied, by virtue of this transac-
23 tion, by any Government agency or department.

24 (3) A contract or contracts for the sale of the San

1 Jacinto Depot shall be consummated as expeditiously as
2 possible thereafter and on such terms as are determined
3 by the Secretary of the Army to be in the best interest of
4 the United States: *Provided*, That if the property is to
5 be conveyed under any terms by which the purchase
6 price is not paid in full simultaneously with the signing
7 of the contract, title shall remain in the United States
8 until full payment is made ~~but there shall be no penalty~~
9 ~~or charges made for deferred payment.~~

10 (4) All proceeds from the sale shall be available
11 to administer the provisions of this section and to pay
12 any and all expenses, including land acquisition, in con-
13 nection with the relocation, exchange, or sale of the
14 San Jacinto Depot or the establishment of a fully in-
15 tegrated depot at Point-Aux-Pins, Alabama, or all pro-
16 ceeds deposited into the Treasury of the United States
17 for obligation by the Army.

18 (5) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
19 such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carry-
20 ing out the provisions of this section, and the monetary
21 limitation imposed by section 502 hereof shall not be
22 inclusive of any funds required for or in connection with
23 the San Jacinto Depot relocation.

24 Notwithstanding any provision of this section to the
25 contrary to the United States may retain possession of the

1 San Jacinto Depot or any part thereof until such time as
2 facilities are substantially completed and available for use
3 at Point-Aux-Pins, Alabama.

4 *TITLE II*

5 SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or
6 develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, con-
7 structing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent
8 or temporary public works, including site preparation,
9 appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following
10 projects:

11 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

12 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

13 Naval Facility, Cape May, New Jersey: Operational
14 and training facilities, \$141,000.

15 Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Drydock,
16 \$10,000,000.

17 Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Operational
18 and training facilities, \$6,000,000: *Provided, however,* That
19 no more than \$500,000 of this sum shall be utilized for
20 protective works until the Secretary of the Navy determines
21 in his judgment that sufficient action has been taken or
22 arrangements made to arrest further subsidence of the ship-
23 yard.

24 Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut:
25 Operational and training facilities, \$2,247,000.

1 Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California: Operational
2 and training facilities, \$766,000.

3 FLEET BASE FACILITIES

4 Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing,
5 and community facilities, \$1,709,000.

6 Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational and train-
7 ing facilities, \$2,546,000.

8 AVIATION FACILITIES

9 (Naval Air Training Stations)

10 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Troop
11 housing, \$1,041,000.

12 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi:
13 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
14 supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community
15 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
16 \$14,940,000.

17 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida:
18 Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground im-
19 provements, and real estate, \$4,679,000.

20 (Fleet Support Air Stations)

21 Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational and
22 training facilities, \$114,000.

23 Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Maintenance
24 facilities, \$1,252,000.

1 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Cali-
2 fornia: Operational and training facilities, \$47,000.

3 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, \$80,000.

5 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Fentress, Virginia:
6 Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

7 Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina:
8 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
9 medical facilities, troop housing, administrative facilities, and
10 utilities and ground improvements, \$11,215,000.

11 Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational
12 and training facilities, \$74,000.

13 Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and
14 training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, admin-
15 istrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground
16 improvements, \$15,823,000.

17 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, community fa-
19 cilities, utilities, and real estate, \$9,892,000.

20 Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California:
21 Operational facilities, and real estate, \$7,000,000.

22 Naval Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field, Florida:
23 Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

1 (Marine Corps Air Stations)

2 Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South
3 Carolina: Operational and training facilities and real estate,
4 \$4,352,000.

5 Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Caro-
6 lina: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,
7 \$1,067,000.

8 Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina:
9 Operational and training facilities, \$1,003,000.

10 Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California:
11 Operational and training facilities, \$2,158,000.

12 (Special Purpose Air Stations)

13 Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force
14 Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training
15 facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administra-
16 tive facilities, troop housing, utilities, and operational and
17 training facilities at the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River,
18 Maryland, \$17,666,000.

19 Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California:
20 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
21 research, development and test facilities, supply facilities,
22 and troop housing (including operational and training facili-
23 ties and troop housing on San Nicolas Island; and mainte-
24 nance facilities, research, development and test facilities,

1 supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground
2 improvements at Camp Cooke), \$13,841,000.

3 SUPPLY FACILITIES

4 Naval Supply Depot, Newport, Rhode Island: Utilities,
5 \$2,210,000.

6 Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Administrative
7 facilities, \$128,000.

8 Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California: Administra-
9 tive facilities, \$146,000.

10 MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

11 Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California:
12 Operational and training facilities, \$280,000.

13 Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Caro-
14 lina: Utilities, \$462,000.

15 Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Opera-
16 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop
17 housing, and utilities, \$5,138,000.

18 Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Operational
19 and training facilities, \$168,000.

20 Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California:
21 Utilities, \$206,000.

22 Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California:
23 Maintenance facilities, \$241,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

1

2 Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Main-
3 tenance facilities, \$86,000.

4 Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California:
5 Supply facilities, \$129,000.

6 Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord, California: Main-
7 tenance facilities, \$2,517,000.

8 Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, California: Re-
9 search, development, and test facilities, \$510,000.

10 Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Virginia: Research,
11 development, and test facilities, \$44,000.

12 Naval Ammunition Depot, Hingham, Massachusetts:
13 Maintenance facilities, \$694,000.

14 Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland:
15 Research, development, and test facilities, \$601,000.

16 SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

17 Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Troop housing,
18 \$14,200,000.

19 Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Vir-
20 ginia: Operational and training facilities, \$1,184,000.

21 Naval Receiving Station, District of Columbia: Opera-
22 tional facilities, \$650,000.

23 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Opera-
24 tional and training facilities, \$1,368,000.

1 Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island: Opera-
2 tional and training facilities, \$273,000.

3 Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, \$4,643,000.

5 Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Opera-
6 tional and training facilities, \$4,199,000.

7 MEDICAL FACILITIES

8 National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland:
9 Hospital and medical facilities, \$8,503,000.

10 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

11 Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Oper-
12 ational and training facilities, and utilities and ground im-
13 provements, \$38,654,000.

14 OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

15 Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Re-
16 search, development, and test facilities, \$192,000.

17 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

18 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

19 Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory
20 of Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, \$159,000.

21 AVIATION FACILITIES

22 Naval Air Station, Agana, Mariana Islands: Opera-
23 tional and training facilities, and real estate, \$4,414,000.

1 Naval Station, Bermuda, British West Indies: Opera-
2 tional and training facilities, \$683,000.

3 Naval Air Station, Ford Island, Territory of Hawaii:
4 Operational and training facilities, \$1,271,000.

5 Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Supply facilities,
6 \$165,000.

7 Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Opera-
8 tional and training facilities, \$3,824,000.

9 SUPPLY FACILITIES

10 Naval Supply Depot, Guam, Mariana Islands: Supply
11 facilities, \$3,060,000.

12 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

13 Naval Communication Unit Number Three, Asmara,
14 Eritrea: Operational and training facilities, \$1,180,000.

15 Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland:
16 Operational and training facilities, \$219,000.

17 Naval Radio Facility, Port Lyautey, Morocco: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, \$519,000.

19 YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

20 Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities,
21 \$890,000.

22 SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish
23 or develop classified naval installations and facilities by
24 acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or in-
25 stalling permanent or temporary public works, including

1 land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and
2 equipment in the total amount of \$75,301,000.

3 SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or
4 develop naval installations and facilities by proceeding with
5 construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions,
6 new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research
7 and development requirements, or improved production
8 schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that de-
9 ferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military
10 construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with
11 interests of national security, and in connection therewith to
12 acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent
13 or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
14 preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the
15 total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary
16 of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on
17 Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives
18 immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of
19 the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under
20 this section, including those real estate actions pertaining
21 thereto.

22 SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of
23 section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119,
24 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized
25 to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing

1 for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities
2 at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies
3 acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade
4 Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454)
5 or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity
6 Credit Corporation:

7 Naval Magazine, Cartagena, Spain, 46 units, and com-
8 munity facilities.

9 Naval Magazine, El Ferrol, Spain, 45 units, and com-
10 munity facilities.

11 Naval Air Station, Port Lyautey, Morocco, 330 units.

12 Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Italy, 122 units, and
13 community facilities.

14 (b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the
15 Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended,
16 the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct fami-
17 ly housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following
18 locations:

19 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

20 Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, 277 units.

21 Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina,
22 800 units.

23 Naval Facility, Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, 27 units.

24 Naval Facility, Centerville, California, 24 units.

25 Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina,
26 849 units.

- 1 Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oregon, 24 units.
- 2 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, 425 units.
- 3 Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 800 units.
- 4 Naval Facility, Nantucket, Massachusetts, 19 units.
- 5 Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500
- 6 units.
- 7 Naval Facility, Pacific Beach, Washington, 30 units.
- 8 Naval Facility, Point Sur, California, 24 units.
- 9 Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, 550
- 10 units.
- 11 Naval Ordnance Missile Test Facility, White Sands
- 12 Proving Grounds, New Mexico, 51 units.
- 13 *Naval Base, San Diego, California, 1,000 units.*
- 14 OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES
- 15 Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of
- 16 Hawaii, 1,140 units.
- 17 Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, Headquarters, Camp H. M.
- 18 Smith, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 168 units.
- 19 Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands, 220 units.
- 20 Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Terri-
- 21 tory of Hawaii, 650 units.
- 22 Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii.
- 23 80 units.

1 Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii,
2 650 units.

3 (c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404
4 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as
5 amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to acquire
6 family housing at the following locations:

7 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, 96
8 units.

9 Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Maryland, 385
10 units.

11 Naval Station, Green Cove Springs, Florida, 392 units.

12 SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Con-
13 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTI-
14 NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

15 Under the subheading "MEDICAL FACILITIES", with re-
16 spect to the Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Virginia Area, strike
17 out "\$12,815,000" and insert in place thereof "\$13,979,-
18 000".

19 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
20 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section
21 402 the amounts "\$139,143,000" and "\$266,927,000", and
22 inserting respectively in place thereof "\$140,307,000", and
23 "\$268,091,000".

24 SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
25 as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202,

1 “\$70,656,000”, and inserting in place thereof “\$72,785,-
2 000”.

3 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
4 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section
5 502 the amounts “\$70,656,000”, and “\$210,704,000” and
6 inserting respectively in place thereof “\$72,785,000”, and
7 “\$212,833,000”.

8 SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
9 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
10 UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:

11 (1) Under the subheading “MARINE CORPS FACIL-
12 ITIES”, with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pen-
13 dleton, California, strike out “\$648,000” and insert in place
14 thereof “\$778,000”.

15 (2) Under the subheading “ORDNANCE FACILITIES”,
16 with respect to the Naval Underwater Ordnance Station,
17 Newport, Rhode Island, strike out “\$370,000” and insert
18 in place thereof “\$411,000”.

19 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
20 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CONTI-
21 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 201, as follows:

22 Under subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES”, with re-
23 spect to the Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Is-
24 lands, by striking out “\$6,525,000” and inserting in place
25 thereof “\$9,063,000” and with respect to the Naval Station,

1 Argentina, Newfoundland, by striking out “\$8,589,800” and
2 inserting in place thereof “\$9,089,800”.

3 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
4 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
5 tion 502 the amounts “\$308,463,600”, “\$108,365,300”, and
6 \$575,592,300” and inserting respectively in place thereof
7 “\$308,634,600”, “\$111,403,300”, and “\$578,801,300”.

8 SEC. 208. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Con-
9 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading “INSIDE
10 THE UNITED STATES” in section 201, as follows:

11 (1) Under the subheading “FLEET BASE FACILITIES”,
12 with respect to the Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island,
13 strike out “\$11,672,000” and insert in place thereof
14 “\$14,601,000”.

15 (2) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
16 (Naval Air Training Stations)”, with respect to the Naval
17 Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas, strike out
18 “\$2,247,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,569,000”;
19 and with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Merid-
20 ian, Mississippi, strike out “\$8,231,000” and insert in place
21 thereof “\$9,141,000”.

22 (3) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
23 (Marine Corps Air Stations)”, with respect to the Marine
24 Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, strike out
25 “\$170,000” and insert in place thereof “\$273,000”.

(4) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES", with respect to the Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia, strike out "\$237,000" and insert in place thereof "\$300,000", and with respect to the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, strike out "\$8,413,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,613,000".

(5) Under the subheading "MEDICAL FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Illinois, strike out "\$12,730,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,754,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 203 "\$85,939,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$86,711,000".

(c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$303,453,000", "\$85,939,000", and "\$451,393,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$312,004,000", "\$86,711,000", and "\$460,716,000".

SEC. 209. Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, insert before "\$7,669,000" the words "and land acquisition,".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$2,649,000.

Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Troop housing, \$990,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$10,659,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,176,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,

1 supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities,
2 troop housing, and utilities, \$10,673,000.

3 Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Community
4 facilities, and utilities, \$229,000.

5 Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan:
6 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
7 supply facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, \$9,948,000.

8 McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington:
9 Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$935,000.

10 Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Main-
11 tenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities,
12 troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,721,000.

13 Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Opera-
14 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop
15 housing, and utilities, \$3,689,000.

16 Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Medical
17 facilities, \$122,000.

18 Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri:
19 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
20 supply facilities, administrative facilities, and real estate,
21 \$2,799,000.

22 Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan:
23 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and
24 utilities and ground improvements, \$3,579,000.

1 Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach,
2 New York: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

3 Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Troop housing, and
4 ground improvements, \$795,000.

5 Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Opera-
6 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and
7 utilities, \$3,992,000.

8 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Opera-
9 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
10 facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, and utilities,
11 \$8,696,000.

12 AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

13 Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Mainte-
14 nance facilities, and supply facilities, \$975,000.

15 Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational
16 and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate,
17 \$1,177,000.

18 Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and
19 training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing,
20 \$1,746,000.

21 Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Utilities,
22 \$157,000.

23 Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania:
24 Supply facilities, \$94,000.

25 McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California:

1 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
2 supply facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing,
3 \$1,560,000.

4 Memphis General Depot, Memphis, Tennessee: Admin-
5 istrative facilities, \$1,464,000.

6 Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California:
7 Supply facilities, \$658,000.

8 Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania:
9 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
10 medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing,
11 community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$6,169,000.

12 Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational
13 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
14 and utilities, \$4,362,000.

15 Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma:
16 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
17 troop housing, and community facilities, \$5,196,000.

18 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Oper-
19 ational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, re-
20 search, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and
21 medical facilities, \$11,037,000.

22 AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

23 Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research,
24 development, and test facilities, and utilities, \$981,000.

25 Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational

1 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, de-
 2 velopment, and test facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and
 3 real estate, \$10,109,000.

4 Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico:
 5 Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utili-
 6 ties, and real estate, \$1,650,000.

7 Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:
 8 Supply facilities, and utilities, \$481,000.

9 Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts:
 10 Maintenance facilities, \$165,000.

11 Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational
 12 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing,
 13 and community facilities, \$2,884,000.

14 SCHOOL OF AVIATION MEDICINE

15 School of Aviation Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base,
 16 San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, re-
 17 search, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, hos-
 18 pital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop
 19 housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improve-
 20 ments, \$12,000,000.

21 AIR TRAINING COMMAND

22 Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational
 23 and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities,
 24 \$979,000.

25 Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational

1 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
2 ties, utilities, and real estate, \$1,584,000.

3 Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Troop hous-
4 ing, \$640,000.

5 Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Troop hous-
6 ing, \$400,000.

7 Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi:
8 Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$208,000.

9 James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Troop
10 housing, \$750,000.

11 Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado, or alternate
12 location: Operational and training facilities, administrative
13 facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities,
14 \$5,000,000.

15 Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance
16 facilities, and utilities, \$441,000.

17 Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Oper-
18 ational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
19 \$1,213,000.

20 McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Opera-
21 tional and training facilities, \$2,119,000.

22 Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Mainte-
23 nance facilities, \$358,000.

24 Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance
25 facilities, \$319,000.

1 Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Oper-
2 ational and training facilities, and utilities, \$245,000.

3 Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Oper-
4 ational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop
5 housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

6 Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Supply facilities,
7 administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$571,000.

8 Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational
9 and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,770,000.

10 Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational
11 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and
12 ground improvements, and real estate, \$3,081,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,361,000.

16 CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

17 Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Troop
18 housing, \$1,805,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio:
Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
supply facilities, and administrative facilities, troop housing,
community facilities, and utilities, \$11,589,000.

23 Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Utilities,
24 \$172,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland:
Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$18,-
937,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina:
Maintenance facilities, \$78,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational
and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities,
\$2,874,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey:
Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
troop housing, and utilities, \$3,901,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Troop hous-
ing, \$423,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational
and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real
estate, \$4,051,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Op-
erational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities,
\$4,280,000.

1 Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Opera-
2 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
3 facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, commu-
4 nity facilities, and utilities, \$7,868,000.

5 Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational
6 and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and
7 utilities, \$5,080,000.

8 Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas:
9 Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,654,000.

10 Brunswick Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Op-
11 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
12 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community
13 facilities, and utilities, \$11,417,000.

14 Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational
15 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing,
16 and utilities, \$7,996,000.

17 Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$2,-
19 257,000.

20 Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Operational
21 and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities,
22 utilities, and real estate, \$4,578,000.

23 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma:
24 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,

1 supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,-
2 734,000.

3 Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Oper-
4 ational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
5 \$1,939,000.

6 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona:
7 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
8 supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,174,000.

9 Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and
10 training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
11 troop housing, and utilities, \$2,404,000.

12 Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational
13 and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,346,000.

14 Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota:
15 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
16 community facilities, and utilities, \$3,241,000.

17 Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington:
18 Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$4,094,000.

19 Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational
20 and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,
21 and utilities, \$2,703,000.

22 Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Opera-
23 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and
24 ground improvements, \$1,489,000.

1 Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational
2 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
3 \$4,493,000.

4 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana:
5 Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,
6 \$3,401,000.

7 Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington:
8 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
9 supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,795,000.

10 Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational
11 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community
12 facilities, \$897,000.

13 Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Operational
14 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
15 ties, and utilities, \$4,250,000.

16 Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas:
17 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utili-
18 ties, \$3,463,000.

19 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Opera-
20 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate,
21 \$11,716,000.

22 Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational
23 and training facilities, and utilities, \$3,774,000.

24 MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational

1 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
2 \$3,577,000.

3 Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Op-
4 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
5 facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,832,000.

6 March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Opera-
7 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and
8 real estate, \$3,344,000.

9 McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational
10 and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real
11 estate, \$5,137,000.

12 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home,
13 Idaho: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities,
14 and community facilities, \$1,039,000.

15 Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational
16 and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate,
17 \$3,265,000.

18 Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire:
19 Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,
20 \$940,000.

21 Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York:
22 Supply facilities, and utilities, \$208,000.

23 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin:
24 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,

1 supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and com-
2 munity facilities, \$15,552,000.

3 Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational
4 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,-
5 352,000.

6 Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Opera-
7 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
8 \$2,997,000.

9 Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Opera-
10 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, community
11 facilities, and utilities, \$8,431,000.

12 Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachu-
13 setts: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,345,000.

14 Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Op-
15 erational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities,
16 and real estate, \$5,185,000.

17 **TACTICAL AIR COMMAND**

18 George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Main-
19 tenance facilities, \$536,000.

20 Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Mainte-
21 nance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,371,000.

22 Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South
23 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance fa-
24 cilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,650,000.

1 Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Troop
2 housing, \$591,000.

3 Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North
4 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities,
5 troop housing, and utilities, \$4,858,000.

6 Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Opera-
7 tional and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,-
8 339,000.

9 Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational
10 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
11 ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real
12 estate, \$5,474,000.

13 SPECIAL FACILITIES

14 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
15 \$563,000.

16 AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

17 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
18 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities,
19 administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, com-
20 munity facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$163,066,000.

21 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

22 AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

23 Various locations: Supply facilities, and utilities,
24 \$696,000.

1 ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

2 Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training
3 facilities, \$380,000.

4 Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training
5 facilities, \$710,000.

6 King Salmon Airport: Operational and training facili-
7 ties, \$340,000.

8 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
9 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities,
10 administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities,
11 utilities and ground improvements, and real estate,
12 \$24,986,000.

13 CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

14 Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and
15 training facilities, \$1,540,000.

16 MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

17 Various locations: Maintenance facilities, supply facili-
18 ties, community facilities, and utilities, \$5,347,000.

19 PACIFIC AIR FORCES

20 Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Opera-
21 tional and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$144,000.

22 Midway Island: Supply facilities, \$839,000.

23 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
24 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-
25 munity facilities, and utilities, \$15,688,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,508,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$643,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$21,431,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$19,952,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$29,135,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$315,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish

1 or develop classified military installations and facilities for
2 ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles by acquiring, con-
3 structing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent
4 or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
5 preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the
6 total amount of \$287,500,000.

7 SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish
8 or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceed-
9 ing with construction made necessary by changes in Air
10 Force missions, new weapons developments, new and un-
11 foreseen research and development requirements, or im-
12 proved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense de-
13 termines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in
14 the next military construction authorization Act would be
15 inconsistent with interests of national security, and in con-
16 nection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate,
17 or install permanent or temporary public works, including
18 land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities,
19 and equipment, in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Pro-*
20 *vided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee,
21 shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate
22 and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching
23 a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of
24 any public work undertaken under this section, including
25 those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

1 SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of
2 section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119,
3 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is author-
4 ized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family
5 housing for occupancy as public quarters and community
6 facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign cur-
7 rencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricul-
8 tural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68
9 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the
10 Commodities Credit Corporation:

11 Lajes Field, Azores, 306 units.

12 Kindley Air Force Base, Bermuda, 300 units.

13 Laon, France, 102 units.

14 Keflavik Airport, Iceland, 300 units.

15 Benguerir Airport, Morocco, 248 units.

16 Sidi Slimane Air Base, Morocco, 295 units.

17 Clark Air Force Base, Philippines, 900 units.

18 Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, 200 units.

19 Madrid-Torrejon area, Spain, 460 units.

20 Moron-San Pablo area, Spain, 40 units.

21 Various locations, Spain, 120 units, and community
22 facilities.

23 Zaragoza Air Base, Spain, 176 units.

24 Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 50 units.

25 Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 190 units.

1 Bruntingthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 93
2 units.

3 Brize Norton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 215 units.

4 Chelveston RAF Station, United Kingdom, 79 units.

5 Chicksands Priory RAF Station, United Kingdom, 83
6 units.

7 Fairford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 177 units.

8 High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 110
9 units.

10 Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 55 units,
11 and community facilities.

12 Stansted-Mountfitchet RAF Station, United Kingdom,
13 22 units.

14 Upper Heyford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 259
15 units.

16 Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, 416 units.

17 (b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of
18 the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as
19 amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to
20 construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters
21 at the following locations:

22 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

23 Camp Adair Air Force Station, Oregon, 150 units.

24 Amarillo Air Force Base, Texas, 500 units.

25 Beale Air Force Base, California, 970 units.

- 1 Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 250 units.
- 2 Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, 450 units.
- 3 Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 536 units.
- 4 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 50 units.
- 5 Custer Air Force Station, Michigan, 169 units.
- 6 Donaldson Air Force Base, South Carolina, 275 units.
- 7 Cooke Air Force Base, California, 525 units.
- 8 Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 500 units.
- 9 Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 530 units.
- 10 Duluth Municipal Airport, Minnesota, 365 units.
- 11 Edwards Air Force Base, California, 778 units.
- 12 Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 220 units.
- 13 Forbes Air Force Base, Kansas, 414 units.
- 14 ~~Custer Air Force Station, Michigan, 169 units.~~
- 15 Fort Lee Air Force Station, Virginia, 154 units.
- 16 Geiger Field, Washington, 168 units.
- 17 Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 460 units.
- 18 Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 744 units.
- 19 Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, 270 units.
- 20 Hamilton Air Force Base, California, 550 units.
- 21 Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, 400 units.
- 22 James Connally Air Force Base, Texas, 366 units.
- 23 Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 290 units.
- 24 Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 475 units.
- 25 K. I. Sawyer Airport, Michigan, 595 units.

- 1 Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, 490 units.
- 2 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Louisiana, 300 units.
- 3 Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, 500 units.
- 4 Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 200 units.
- 5 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio, 400 units.
- 6 Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 150 units.
- 7 Mather Air Force Base, California, 220 units.
- 8 McChord Air Force Base, Washington, 1,000 units.
- 9 McClellan Air Force Base, California, 540 units.
- 10 McCoy Air Force Base, Florida, 668 units.
- 11 McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, 1,450 units.
- 12 Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 932 units.
- 13 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 270 units.
- 14 Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, 200 units.
- 15 Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, New York, 290 units.
- 16 Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 616 units.
- 17 Oxnard Air Force Base, California, 315 units.
- 18 Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, 483 units.
- 19 Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.
- 20 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wisconsin, 900 units.
- 21 Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Missouri, 610 units.
- 22 Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, 150 units.
- 23 Selfridge Air Force Base, Michigan, 580 units.
- 24 Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas, 500 units.
- 25 Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa, 235 units.

- 1 Stewart Air Force Base, New York, 300 units.
- 2 Suffolk County Air Force Base, New York, 220 units.
- 3 Syracuse Air Force Station, New York, 216 units.
- 4 Topsham Air Force Station, Maine, 177 units.
- 5 Truax Field, Wisconsin, 280 units.
- 6 Turner Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units.
- 7 United States Air Force Academy, Colorado, 300 units.
- 8 Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 230 units.
- 9 Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts, 310 units.
- 10 Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 154 units.
- 11 Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, 150 units.
- 12 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 618 units.

13 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

- 14 Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, 1,050 units.
- 15 Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, 600 units.
- 16 (c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404
- 17 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652),
- 18 as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized
- 19 to acquire family housing at the following locations:
- 20 Brookley Air Force Base, Alabama, 175 units.
- 21 Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, 600 units.
- 22 Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 225 units.
- 23 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, 550 units.

1 Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, 500
2 units.

3 Hunter Air Force Base, Georgia, 500 units.

4 Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, 592 units.

5 Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, 480 units.

6 March Air Force Base, California, 644 units.

7 Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, 250 units.

8 Mitchel Air Force Base, New York, 628 units.

9 Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, 612 units.

10 Reese Air Force Base, Texas, 418 units.

11 Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, 400 units.

12 Walker Air Force Base, New Mexico, 800 units.

13 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, 2,000 units.

14 SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-
15 gress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "CONTI-
16 NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

17 Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND", with
18 respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts,
19 strike out "\$6,076,000," and insert in place thereof "\$6,-
20 522,000".

21 Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND",
22 with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton,
23 Ohio, strike out "\$14,508,000" and insert in place thereof
24 "\$15,800,000".

25 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as

1 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
2 tion 502 the amounts “\$824,300,000” and “\$1,363,-
3 189,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$826,038,000”
4 and “\$1,364,927,000”, respectively.

5 SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
6 as amended, is amended, under the heading “INSIDE THE
7 UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

8 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

9 (1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport,
10 Duluth, Minnesota, strike out “\$1,469,000” and insert
11 in place thereof “\$1,636,000”.

12 (2) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Fal-
13 mouth, Massachusetts, strike out “\$11,577,000” and
14 insert in place thereof “\$13,341,000”.

15 Under the subheading “AIR MATERIEL COMMAND”, with
16 respect to Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, strike out
17 “\$1,339,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,661,000”.

18 Under the subheading “AIR TRAINING COMMAND”, with
19 respect to James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas,
20 strike out “\$4,687,000” and insert in place thereof “\$5,-
21 301,000”.

22 Under the subheading “STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND”,
23 with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls,
24 Montana, strike out “\$1,586,000” and insert in place thereof
25 “\$1,726,000”.

1 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
2 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section
3 402 the amounts "\$811,342,000" and "\$1,447,950,000"
4 and inserting in place thereof "\$814,349,000" and "\$1,450,-
5 957,000", respectively.

6 SEC. 307. (a) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Con-
7 gress, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED
8 STATES" in section 301, as follows:

9 Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—

10 (1) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glas-
11 gow, Montana, strike out "\$2,048,000" and insert in
12 place thereof "\$2,390,000".

13 (2) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base,
14 Kansas City, Missouri, strike out "\$1,100,000" and in-
15 sert in place thereof "\$1,348,000".

16 (3) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot,
17 North Dakota, strike out "\$6,804,000" and insert in
18 place thereof "\$8,507,000".

19 (4) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth,
20 Massachusetts, strike out "\$559,000" and insert in place
21 thereof "\$615,000".

22 Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND",
23 with respect to Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas,
24 strike out "\$899,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,128,-
25 000".

1 Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND", with
 2 respect to Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas, strike out
 3 "\$460,000" and insert in place thereof "\$637,000".

4 Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

5 (1) with respect to Barksdale Air Force Base,
 6 Shreveport, Louisiana, strike out "\$3,344,000" and
 7 insert in place thereof "\$3,633,000".

8 (2) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marys-
 9 ville, California, strike out "\$7,458,000" and insert in
 10 place thereof "\$9,087,000".

11 (3) with respect to MacDill Air Force Base,
 12 Tampa, Florida, strike out "\$936,000" and insert in
 13 place thereof "\$1,268,000".

14 (4) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base,
 15 Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out "\$2,344,000"
 16 and insert in place thereof "\$2,947,000".

17 (5) with respect to Whiteman Air Force Base,
 18 Knob Noster, Missouri, strike out "\$235,000" and insert
 19 in place thereof "\$306,000".

20 (b) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is
 21 amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the
 22 amounts "\$394,076,000" and "\$601,781,000" and inserting
 23 in place thereof "\$399,755,000" and "\$607,460,000",
 24 respectively.

25 SEC. 308. (a) Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Con-

gress, is amended, under the heading "ALERT AND DISPERSAL OF STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND FORCES" in section 1, as follows:

(1) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out "\$895,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,892,000".

(2) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out "\$867,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,479,000".

(3) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out "\$4,380,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,479,000".

(4) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "\$690,000" and insert in place thereof \$969,000".

(b) Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended by striking out in section 3 the amount "\$549,670,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$552,657,000".

SEC. 309. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure "\$135,425,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure "\$139,797,000".

SEC. 310. The last paragraph under the heading "RE-

1 SEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND" in title III of
2 Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress (69 Stat. 342),
3 is amended to read as follows:

4 "Various Locations: Research, development, and opera-
5 tional facilities (including not more than \$357,000 for an
6 off-base roadway approximately ten miles in length in the
7 vicinity of the north boundary of Cape Canaveral—an aux-
8 iliary to Patrick Air Force Base) \$20,000,000."

9 The amendment made by this section is effective from
10 March 1, 1956.

11 TITLE IV

12 SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or
13 develop installations and facilities required for advanced
14 research projects and in connection therewith may acquire,
15 construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or
16 temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
17 preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the
18 total amount of \$50,000,000.

19 The Secretary of Defense shall report in detail semi-
20 annually to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker
21 of the House of Representatives with respect to the exer-
22 cise of the authority granted by this title.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 529, 40 U. S. C. 259, 267), and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations, for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$112,218,000; outside the United States, \$8,732,000;

1 section 102, \$201,121,000; section 103, \$10,000,000;
2 or a total of \$332,071,000.

3 (2) for title II: Inside the United States,
4 \$217,363,000; outside the United States, \$16,384,000;
5 section 202, \$75,301,000; section 203, \$10,000,000;
6 or a total of \$319,048,000.

7 (3) for title III: Inside the United States,
8 \$536,218,000; outside the United States, \$123,654,000;
9 section 302, \$287,500,000; section 303, \$10,000,000;
10 or a total of \$957,372,000.

11 (4) for title IV: \$50,000,000.

12 SEC. 503. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and
13 III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary con-
14 cerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside
15 the United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside
16 the United States. However, the total cost of all projects
17 in each such title may not be more than the total amount
18 authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

19 SEC. 504. Any outstanding authority heretofore pro-
20 vided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119),
21 the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of
22 August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991), for the provision of family
23 housing shall be available for the construction of family
24 housing at any installations for which appropriated fund

1 family housing is authorized to be constructed under titles
2 I and III of this Act.

3 SEC. 505. Whenever—

4 (1) the President determines that compliance with
5 section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for
6 contracts made under this Act for the establishment or
7 development of military installations and facilities in
8 foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of
9 this Act; and

10 (2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller
11 General have agreed upon alternative methods of ade-
12 quately auditing those contracts; the President may
13 exempt those contracts from the requirements of that
14 section.

15 SEC. 506. Contracts made by the United States under
16 this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a com-
17 petitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national
18 security will not be impaired and the award is consistent
19 with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and sec-
20 tion 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547, 551).
21 The Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the mili-
22 tary departments shall report semi-annually to the Presi-
23 dent of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Repre-
24 sentatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other
25 than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

1 SEC. 507. As of July 1, 1959, all authorization for mili-
2 tary public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of
3 a military department in connection with the establishment
4 or development of military installations and facilities, and all
5 authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained
6 in Acts approved before August 4, 1956, and not superseded
7 or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed,
8 except—

9 (1) authorizations for public works and for appro-
10 priations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the
11 titles that contain the general provisions;

12 (2) the authorization for public works projects
13 as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for
14 construction contracts or land acquisition in whole or
15 in part before July 1, 1959, and authorizations for
16 appropriations therefor;

17 (3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for
18 family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is
19 contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952
20 (66 Stat. 606, 622) ;

21 (4) the authorizations for public works and the
22 appropriation of funds that are contained in sections
23 2231-2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended
24 (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886) ;

25 (5) the authorization for the development of the

1 Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$30,-
2 000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the
3 Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609) ;

4 (6) the authorization for development of classified
5 facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in
6 title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951
7 (65 Stat. 336, 343) ;

8 (7) the authorization for public works and for the
9 appropriation of funds that are contained in the Act of
10 April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended; and

11 (8) notwithstanding the provision of section 506 of
12 the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 558), the
13 authorization for:

14 (a) jet engine test cells in the amount of \$1,-
15 850,000 at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia,
16 that is contained in title II, section 201 under the
17 heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and sub-
18 heading "AVIATION FACILITIES" of the Act of
19 August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 440, 442), as amended;

20 (b) ammunition storage facilities in the
21 amount of \$225,000 at the Naval Auxiliary Air
22 Station, El Centro, California; navigational aids in
23 the amount of \$590,000 at the Marine Corps Air
24 Station, El Toro, California; research and develop-
25 ment facilities in the amount of \$1,804,000 at the

1 Naval Air Turbine Test Station, Trenton, New Jer-
2 sey; and navigational aids in the amount of
3 \$400,000 at the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island,
4 Washington: that are contained in title II, section
5 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED
6 STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES"
7 of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 540),
8 as amended;

9 (c) the development of aviation ordnance facili-
10 ties in the amount of \$2,638,000 that is contained
11 in title II, section 202, of the Act of July 27, 1954
12 (68 Stat. 535, 543), as amended;

13 (d) the development of ammunition storage
14 depot and ammunition loading terminal facilities,
15 Point Aux Pins Area, Alabama-Mississippi, in the
16 amount of \$44,168,000 that is contained in title I,
17 section 101, of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat.
18 535, 536), as amended.

19 SEC. 508. Section 408 (b) of the Act of June 17, 1950
20 (64 Stat. 236, 245), is hereby repealed.

21 SEC. 509. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955
22 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to
23 read as follows:

24 "SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1958 through and in-
25 cluding 1961, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air

1 Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities
2 at or near military tactical installations for assignment as
3 public quarters to military personnel and their dependents,
4 if any, without rental charge upon a détermination by the
5 Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack
6 of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical
7 installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a
8 family or individual unit basis and not more than five thou-
9 sand of such units may be so leased at any one time. Ex-
10 penditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be
11 made out of appropriations available for maintenance and
12 operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such
13 unit.”

14 SEC. 510. Section 406 of the Act of August 3, 1956
15 (70 Stat 991, 1015), is amended to read as follows:

16 “SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of a military department
17 may acquire any interest in land that—

18 “(1) he or his designee determines is needed in the
19 interest of national defense; and

20 “(2) does not cost more than \$25,000 (exclusive of
21 administrative costs and the amounts of any deficiency
22 judgments).

23 This section does not authorize the acquisition, as part of
24 the same project, of two or more contiguous parcels of land
25 that together cost more than \$25,000.”

1 · SEC. 511. Section 408 (a) of the Act of August 3,
2 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), is amended by adding the fol-
3 lowing new subsection at the end thereof:

4 “(5) No determination that a project is urgently re-
5 quired shall be necessary for projects, the cost of which is
6 not in excess of \$5,000.”

7 SEC. 512. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act
8 of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), is amended to read
9 as follows:

10 “(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law,
11 and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be
12 contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installa-
13 tions or activities unless the actual number of units involved
14 has been specifically authorized by an annual military con-
15 struction authorization Act except (1) housing units required
16 to be acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404
17 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) housing units
18 leased, utilizing available operation and maintenance appro-
19 priations, for terms of one year, whether renewable or not,
20 or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the pro-
21 visions of section 417 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat.
22 991, 1018) ; and (3) rental guaranty family housing author-
23 ized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat.
24 606, 622) ; and (4) to the extent that any of the author-
25 ization of subsection 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b) of

1 this Act to construct housing at locations specified therein
2 are not utilized, such authorization may be exercised to con-
3 struct housing at other locations: *Provided*, That the total
4 number of housing units to be constructed under the authority
5 of this subsection may not exceed for any service 10 per
6 centum of the total number of units authorized in its sub-
7 section: *Provided, further*, That the Secretaries of the three
8 military departments, or the designee of each, shall notify
9 the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House
10 of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision
11 to utilize the authority granted by this section.

12 TITLE VI

13 RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

14 SEC. 601. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as
15 follows:

16 (1) That part of section 2233 (a) that precedes clause
17 (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

18 “§ 2233. Acquisition

19 “(a) Subject to sections 2233a, 2234, 2235, 2236, and
20 2238 of this title and subsection (c) of this section, the
21 Secretary of Defense may—”.

22 (2) Section 2233 is amended by adding the following
23 new subsections at the end thereof:

24 “(e) The Secretary of Defense may procure advance
25 planning, construction design, and architectural services in

1 connection with facilities to be established or developed under
 2 this chapter which are not otherwise authorized by law.”

3 “(f) Facilities authorized by subsection (a) shall not
 4 be considered ‘military public works’ under the provisions of
 5 the military construction authorization acts that repeal prior
 6 authorizations for military public works.”

7 (3) The following new section is inserted after section
 8 2233:

9 “§ 2233a. Limitation

10 “No expenditure or contribution that is more than
 11 \$50,000 may be made under section 2233 of this title for
 12 any facility that has not been authorized by a law authoriz-
 13 ing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces.
 14 This requirement does not apply to the following:

15 “(a) Facilities acquired by lease.

16 “(b) Facilities acquired, constructed, expanded, re-
 17 habilitated, converted, or equipped to restore or replace
 18 facilities damaged or destroyed, where the Senate and the
 19 House of Representatives have been notified of that ac-
 20 tion.”

21 (4) The analysis of chapter 133 is amended by inserting
 22 the following new item:

“2233a. Limitation.”

23 SEC. 602. (a) Section 3 of the National Defense Facil-
 24 ities Act of 1950, as amended by paragraph (a) of the Act

1 of August 9, 1955, chapter 662 (69 Stat. 593), and by
2 section 2 of the Act of August 29, 1957, Public Law 85-215
3 (71 Stat. 489), is amended by striking out the words "in an
4 amount not to exceed \$580,000,000 over a period of the next
5 eight fiscal years commencing with fiscal year 1951,".

6 (b) Section 3 (a) of the National Defense Facilities
7 Act of 1950, as amended by section 414 of the Act of
8 August 3, 1956, chapter 939 (70 Stat. 1018), is amended
9 by striking out the words "and without regard to the mone-
10 tary limitation otherwise imposed by this section".

11 SEC. 603. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United
12 States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or de-
13 velop the following facilities for reserve forces:

14 (1) For Department of the Navy:

15 NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

16 Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta,
17 Georgia: Training facilities, \$480,000.

18 Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Supply facilities and
19 utilities, \$259,000.

20 Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance fa-
21 cilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$652,000.

22 Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Navigational aids
23 and utilities, \$179,000.

24 Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Airfield light-
25 ing, \$147,000.

1 Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Opera-
 2 tional and training facilities, liquid fueling and dispensing fa-
 3 cilities, airfield lighting, and land acquisition, \$1,992,000.

4 Naval Air Station, New Orleans (Alvin Callender
 5 Field), Louisiana: Administrative facilities, community fa-
 6 cilities, navigational aids, operational facilities, supply facili-
 7 ties, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,447,000.

8 Naval Air Station, New York, New York: Airfield
 9 lighting, \$130,000.

10 Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Opera-
 11 tional and training facilities, and utilities, \$652,000.

12 Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational and
 13 training facilities, \$570,000.

14 Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts:
 15 Utilities, \$407,000.

16 Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Utili-
 17 ties, \$99,000.

18 NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

19 Alameda, California: Waterfront operational facilities,
 20 \$128,000.

21 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Bloomington, In-
 22 diana: Training facilities, \$95,000.

23 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Bos-
 24 ton, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$108,000.

1 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Centralia, Washing-
2 ton: Training facilities, \$81,000.

3 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Chillicothe, Ohio:
4 Training facilities, \$100,000.

5 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Danville, Ken-
6 tucky: Training facilities, \$84,000.

7 Naval Reserve Training Center, Dunkirk, New York:
8 Training facilities, \$79,000.

9 Fort Schuyler, New York: Waterfront operational facili-
10 ties, \$120,000.

11 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Hayward, Califor-
12 nia: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$99,000.

13 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center,
14 Honolulu, Hawaii: Training facilities, \$515,000.

15 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Iowa City, Iowa:
16 Training facilities \$97,000.

17 Master Control Radio Station, New Orleans, Louisiana:
18 Communications, \$210,000.

19 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Olympia (Tum-
20 water), Washington: Training facilities, \$47,000.

21 Naval Reserve Training Center, Pasadena, California:
22 Training facilities, \$132,000.

23 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Port Chicago, Cali-
24 fornia: Training facilities, \$94,000.

1 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San
2 Jose, California: Land acquisition, \$78,000.

3 Saint Petersburg, Florida: Waterfront operational facili-
4 ties, \$26,000.

5 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center,
6 Steubenville, Ohio: Land acquisition, \$18,000.

7 Naval Reserve Training Center, White Oak (Lewiston),
8 Maryland: Training facilities, \$557,000.

9 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Yakima, Washing-
10 ton: Training facilities, \$48,000.

11 MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)

12 Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Lynchburg,
13 Virginia: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$388,000.

14 Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Memphis, Ten-
15 nessee: Training facilities, \$453,000.

16 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center,
17 Moline, Illinois: Training facilities, \$152,000.

18 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center,
19 Pasadena, California: Training facilities, \$163,000.

20 (2) For Department of the Air Force:

21 AIR FORCE RESERVE

22 Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland:
23 Operational and training facilities, \$129,000.

24 Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, utilities and ground improve-
2 ments, and land acquisition, \$3,174,000.

3 Bates Field, Mobile, Alabama: Maintenance facility,
4 \$97,000.

5 Bradley Field, Windsor Locks, Connecticut: Mainte-
6 nance facility and utilities and ground improvements,
7 \$160,000.

8 Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Maintenance facility,
9 and supply facility, \$325,000.

10 General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Main-
11 tenance facility, and operational and training facilities,
12 \$173,000.

13 Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, New Hampshire:
14 Operational and training facilities, \$180,000.

15 Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Belton, Missouri:
16 Operational and training facilities, \$101,000.

17 Naval Air Station (Alvin Callender Field), Orleans
18 Parish, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities,
19 \$622,000.

20 Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Main-
21 tenance facility, \$93,000.

22 AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

23 Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational
24 and training facilities, and hospital and medical facilities,
25 \$171,000.

1 Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts: Operational and
2 training facilities, \$740,000.

3 Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel, Minnesota:
4 Site improvements, \$500,000.

5 Birmingham Municipal Airport, Birmingham, Alabama:
6 Operational and training facilities, \$150,000.

7 Byrd Field, Richmond, Virginia: Supply facilities,
8 \$50,000.

9 Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational
10 and training facilities, \$579,000.

11 Capital Airport, Springfield, Illinois: Supply facilities,
12 \$78,000.

13 Des Moines Municipal Airport, Des Moines, Iowa:
14 Operational and training facilities, \$53,000.

15 Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Operational and
16 training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and
17 utilities and ground improvements, \$1,308,000.

18 Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, New Hampshire:
19 Operational and training facilities, \$170,000.

20 Gulfport Municipal Airport, Gulfport, Mississippi:
21 Supply facilities, \$362,000.

22 Hayward Municipal Airport, Hayward, California:
23 Operational and training facilities, \$113,000.

24 Hensley Field, Grand Prairie, Texas: Operational and
25 training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,862,000.

1 Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational and train-
2 ing facilities, and supply facilities, \$159,000.

3 Kellogg Field, Battle Creek, Michigan: Operational and
4 training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and
5 ground improvements, \$1,136,000.

6 Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:
7 Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,
8 \$570,000.

9 Martinsburg Municipal Airport, Martinsburg, West Vir-
10 ginia: Operational and training facilities, \$123,000.

11 O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Opera-
12 tional and training facilities, \$1,099,000.

13 Ontario International Airport, Ontario, California:
14 Operational and training facilities, \$127,000.

15 Portland Municipal Airport, Portland, Oregon: Supply
16 facilities and maintenance facilities, \$233,000.

17 Rosecrans Field, Saint Joseph, Missouri: Operational
18 and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$123,000.

19 San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico:
20 Supply facilities, \$70,000.

21 Sky Harbor Airport, Phoenix, Arizona: Operational and
22 training facilities, \$655,000.

23 Standiford Field, Louisville, Kentucky: Operational and
24 training facilities, and administrative facilities, \$715,000.

1 Theodore F. Green Airport, Providence, Rhode Island:
2 Operational and training facilities, \$213,000.

3 Travis Field, Savannah, Georgia: Housing, supply fa-
4 cilities and utilities, \$317,000.

5 Various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, \$300,000.

6 (3) For Department of the Army:

7 ARMY RESERVE

8 Batavia, New York: Training facilities, \$171,000.

9 Beckley, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$289,000.

10 Beloit, Wisconsin: Training facilities, \$157,000.

11 Canandaigua, New York: Training facilities, \$171,000.

12 Canton, Ohio: Training facilities, \$40,000.

13 Cheyenne, Wyoming: Training facilities, \$149,000.

14 Durant, Oklahoma: Training facilities, \$141,000.

15 Fargo, North Dakota: Training facilities, \$149,000.

16 Fremont, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.

17 Galesburg, Illinois: Training facilities, \$157,000.

18 Greenwood, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$85,000.

19 Hempstead, New York (Nr2): Training facilities,
20 \$536,000.

21 Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$99,000.

22 Kewaunee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, \$157,000.

23 Madison, Wisconsin (Nr2): Training facilities,
24 \$490,000.

1 Oklahoma City, Oklahoma (Nr2) : Training facilities,
2 \$443,000.

3 Saint Marys, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.

4 Saint Marys, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$149,000.

5 Salinas, California: Training facilities, \$164,000.

6 Sinton, Texas: Training facilities, \$134,000.

7 Stockton, California: Training facilities, \$164,000.

8 Warren, Ohio: Training facilities, \$289,000.

9 Weirton, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$149,000.

10 Land acquisition: Training facilities, \$419,000.

11 ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

12 (ARMORY)

13 Ackerman, Mississippi: Training facilities, \$54,000.

14 Agawam, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$170,000.

15 Ashford, Alabama: Training facilities, \$70,000.

16 Beckley, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$200,000.

17 Belton, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$122,000.

18 Berryville, Arkansas: Training facilities \$45,000.

19 Berryville, Virginia: Training facilities, \$135,000.

20 Bethel, Alaska: Training facilities, \$480,000.

21 Caldwell, Ohio: Training facilities, \$135,000.

22 Calhoun, Georgia: Training facilities, \$110,000.

23 Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$206,000.

24 Espanola, New Mexico: Training facilities, \$57,000.

- 1 Fairbanks, Alaska: Training facilities, \$277,000.
- 2 Gainesville, Texas: Training facilities, \$111,000.
- 3 Hollister, California: Training facilities, \$105,000.
- 4 Honey Grove, Texas: Training facilities, \$90,000.
- 5 Juncos, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, \$38,000.
- 6 Livingston, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
- 7 Lovell, Wyoming: Training facilities, \$142,000.
- 8 Mayaguez, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, \$160,000.
- 9 Middleboro, Kentucky: Training facilities, \$130,000.
- 10 Northwest Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities,
11 \$130,000.
- 12 Pitman, New Jersey: Training facilities, \$175,000.
- 13 Rigby, Idaho: Training facilities, \$57,000.
- 14 Salem, South Dakota: Training facilities, \$150,000.
- 15 Saranac Lake, New York: Training facilities, \$300,000.
- 16 Shallotte, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$95,000.
- 17 Smithfield, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.
- 18 South Portland, Maine: Training facilities, \$150,000.
- 19 Sturgis, Michigan: Training facilities, \$220,000.
- 20 Swanton, Vermont: Training facilities, \$137,000.
- 21 Valparaiso, Indiana: Training facilities, \$188,000.
- 22 Whitman, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$170,000.
- 23 Whitmire, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
- 24 Winnemucca, Nevada: Training facilities, \$110,000.

1 ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (NON-
2 ARMORY)

3 Augusta, Maine: Administrative facilities, \$90,000.

4 Burlington, Vermont: Supply facilities, \$208,000.

5 Camp Beauregard, Louisiana: Supply facilities, \$325,-
6 000.

7 Camp Dodge, Iowa: Supply facilities, \$120,000.

8 Concord, New Hampshire: Supply facilities, \$145,000.

9 Kalispell, Montana: Maintenance facilities, \$67,000.

10 Trenton, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, \$80,000.

11 (4) For all reserve components: Facilities made nec-
12 essary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equip-
13 ment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his
14 designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclu-
15 sion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific
16 facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the in-
17 terests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense
18 or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Repre-
19 sentatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to
20 implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility
21 to be undertaken under this subsection.

22 SEC. 604. The first sentence of section 2233a of title 10,
23 United States Code, does not apply to—

24 (a) facilities that—

25 (1) have been the subject of consultation with

the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives before July 1, 1958;

(2) are under contract before July 1, 1960; and

(3) are funded from appropriations made before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(b) facilities that are authorized by section 603 (4) of this Act; or

(c) The following facilities for the Air National Guard of the United States.

(1) Milford Point, Connecticut: Operational and training facilities, \$337,000.

(2) Wellesley, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, \$319,000.

(3) Westchester County Airport, White Plains, New York: Operational and training facilities, \$105,000.

SEC. 605. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this Title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and section 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is

1 held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or
2 land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land,
3 and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift,
4 purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

5 SEC. 606. Appropriations for facilities projects author-
6 ized by section 603 for the respective reserve components
7 of the armed forces may not exceed—

8 (1) for Department of the Navy: Naval and
9 Marine Corps Reserves, \$11,886,000.

10 (2) for Department of the Air Force:

11 (a) Air Force Reserve, \$5,054,000;

12 (b) Air National Guard of the United States,
13 \$11,976,000.

14 (3) for Department of the Army: Army Reserve
15 and Army National Guard of the United States,
16 \$11,042,000.

17 SEC. 607. Any of the amounts named in section 603 of
18 this Act may in, the discretion of the Secretary of Defense,
19 be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all
20 projects authorized for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves,
21 the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard of the United
22 States, and the Army Reserve and the Army National
23 Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts

1 named in clauses 1, 2 (a), 2 (b), and 3 of section 606 re-
2 spectively.

3 SEC. 608. This title may be cited as the “Reserve
4 Forces Facilities Act of 1958”.

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 13015

[Report No. 1957]

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military
installations, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VINSON

JUNE 18, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

JUNE 24, 1958

Reported with amendments, committed to the Com-
mittee of the Whole House on the State of the
Union, and ordered to be printed

(House No. 100)

A BILL

to amend the act to provide for the establishment of a

of the

and to provide for the establishment of a

and to provide for the establishment of a

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 2, 1958
For actions of July 1, 1958
85th-2d, No. 109

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	1,17	Libraries.....	30	Research.....	15
Area redevelopment.....	2	Livestock.....	40	Rice.....	42
Buildings.....	32	Military construction.....	3	Roads.....	12
CCC.....	3	Milk.....	29,46	School lunch.....	29
Civil defense.....	14	Minerals.....	22	Small business.....	13
Corn.....	21	National Flower.....	21,26	Statehood.....	7,20,28
Data processing.....	10	Ocean freight.....	1,38	Surplus commodities.....	6,8,38
Development loan fund....	1	Patents.....	44	Technical assistance....	38
Education.....	37	Personnel.....	19	Timber.....	13
Electrification.....	24	Price supports.....	29,46	Trade agreements.....	18
Ethics.....	19	Procedure.....	31	Transportation.....	43
Farm program.....	39	Property.....	30	Water resources.....	45
Flood control.....	4,33	Public Law 480.....	3,6	Weather control.....	15
Food additives.....	36	Reclamation.....	35	Wool.....	41
Foreign aid.....	1,9,38				
Foreign trade.....	6,11,18				
Forestry.....	12,13,29,34				
Grain standards.....	16				
Imports.....	5				
Industrial uses.....	39				
Lands.....	25,35				
Laws.....	27				
Legislative program.....	23				

HIGHLIGHTS: House debated mutual security appropriation bill. House committee reported area redevelopment bill. Senate passed bill to make Small Business Administration permanent agency.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Began debate on H. R. 13192, the mutual security appropriation bill for 1959. (pp. 11630-664, 11674-675) As reported by the Appropriations Committee, the bill includes \$300,000,000 for advances to the development loan fund, \$171,500,000 for technical cooperation programs, and \$2,100,000 for the payment of ocean freight charges to move supplies donated to and by American voluntary agencies.
2. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendment S. 3683, to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas (H. Rept. 2099). p. 11678
3. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 13015, to authorize construction at military installations, including authorization for financing from the foreign currencies acquired under Public Law 480 or through other commodity transactions of CCC. p. 11678, 11665

4. FLOOD CONTROL. The Public Works Committee ordered reported H. R. 9924, to authorize a compact between Conn. and Mass. relating to flood control. p. D622, 11666
5. IMPORTS. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 6006, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement of the Antidumping Act. Senate conferees have not yet been appointed. p. 11665
6. FOREIGN TRADE; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Rep. Reuss expressed concern over the effects of Public Law 480 transactions on certain friendly foreign countries, and urged the Agriculture Committee to include a provision in legislation extending the program to require "reasonable precautions to avoid displacing usual marketings of foreign countries." pp. 11675-676
7. STATEHOOD. Delegate Burns, Hawaii, commended the admission of Alaska as a State, and urged passage of similar legislation for the admission of Hawaii. p. 11667
8. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Received from this Department the first monthly report of the General Sales Manager concerning the policies, activities, and developments, including all sales and disposals, with regard to each commodity which CCC owns or is directed to support; to Agriculture Committees. pp. 11554, 11677
9. FOREIGN AID. Received from the Deputy Manager of the Development Loan Fund, letters relative to the establishment of loans for Paraguay, Pakistan, and Thailand under provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954. p. 11677
10. DATA PROCESSING. Both Houses received from GAO a report on a survey made by that agency of the progress and trend of development and use of automatic (electronic) data processing in the business and management control systems of the Government. pp. 11554, 11677
11. FOREIGN TRADE. Both Houses received from the Tariff Commission a report on the operation of the trade agreements program. pp. 11554, 11677

SENATE

12. FORESTRY. Sen. Murray commended the Forest Service, commented on a progress report concerning the Northern Region, and inserted an editorial, "Access Roads Needed For Best Forest Use." pp. 11561-2
13. SMALL BUSINESS. Passed with amendments H. R. 7963, to make the Small Business Administration a permanent agency and increase the SBA loan authority (pp. 11558, 11589, 11595-601, 11606-15).
Adopted the following amendments in addition to the committee amendments:
By Sen. Javits, to authorize assistance by SBA in joint research and development programs (pp. 11597-11601);
By Sen. Thye, 55 to 26, to make the SBA a permanent agency (pp. 11606-10);
By Sen. Morse, to make the act applicable to sales of property by the Government, which Sen. Murray had stated earlier was the result of complaints about timber sales (p. 11558) (pp. 11610-11); and
By Sen. Capehart, to retain the Loan Policy Board of the Administrator and the Secretaries of the Treasury and Commerce (pp. 11611-12)
Rejected an amendment by Sen. Bush to retain the present loan limit of \$250,000 in place of the \$350,000 suggested by the Committee (pp. 11612-13).

CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 13015

JULY 1, 1958.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 617]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 617, reports the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

○

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. RES. 617

[Report No. 2104]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 1, 1958

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution;
which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it
2 shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into
3 the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the
4 Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13015) to
5 authorize certain construction at military installations, and
6 for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be
7 confined to the bill and continue not to exceed two hours,
8 to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and
9 ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Serv-
10 ices, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-
11 minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the
12 bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the

- 1 bill to the House with such amendments as may have been
- 2 adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as
- 3 ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage
- 4 without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

House Calendar No. 238

85TH CONGRESS
2D Session

H. RES. 617

[Report No. 2104]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of H. R. 13015,
a bill to authorize certain construction at
military installations, and for other pur-
poses.

By Mr. MADDEN

JULY 1, 1958

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be
printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 10, 1958
For actions of July 9, 1958
85th-2d, No. 114

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....6		
Appropriations.....2,39		
Atomic energy.....14		
CCC.....41		
Cooperatives.....1,28		
Dairy program.....13		
Economic situation.....5,25,40		
Education.....10		
Expenditures.....3,29		
Farm income.....27	Labor standards.....35	Public Law 480.....12,41
Farm program.....38	Lands.....6,21	Reclamation.....44
Federal-State Relations.....42	Legislative program.....20	Research.....6,24
Fisheries.....33	Libraries.....7,22,46	Rural development.....26
Flag.....37	Livestock.....34	Security.....13,20
Flood control.....23	Marketing facilities.....17	Small business.....11
Foot-and-mouth disease.....6	Military	Statehood.....4,15,31
Foreign aid.....19,30	construction.....12,20,41	Textiles.....32
Forestry.....6,16	Minerals.....36,43	Tobacco.....6,35
Information.....7,22,46	Paperwork.....46	Training.....45
Insecticides.....8	Personnel.....3,13,45	Water.....8
Inspection services.....9	Property.....47	Wildlife.....8

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed public works appropriation bill.

SENATE

1. COOPERATIVES. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 2444, to authorize producers' cooperatives to bargain with purchasers singly or in groups (S. Rept. 1810). p. 11967
2. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 12853, the civil functions appropriations bill for the Army Corps of Engineers, certain agencies of the Interior Department, and TVA, for 1959. pp. 11990-12008
3. EXPENDITURES; PERSONNEL. Sen. Byrd submitted the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures on Federal employment and pay for May 1958. pp. 11968-71
4. STATEHOOD. Sen. Bible commended the passage of the Alaska statehood bill and Sen. Monroney concurred. pp. 11979-80
5. ECONOMIC SITUATION. Sen. Potter inserted the speeches of the President, Ralph Cordiner of GE, and Thomas McCabe of Scott Paper Co., at the economic mobilization conference on the economic situation and efforts made to accelerate the upturn in the economy. pp. 11980-5

6. RESEARCH; LANDS; TOBACCO. The Agriculture Committee reported the following bills: (p. 12086)
 - S. 3076, without amendment, to authorize the transportation in the U. S. of live foot-and-mouth disease virus for research purposes (H. Rept. 2126).
 - H. R. 6542, without amendment, to authorize the conveyance of certain forest lands to the town of Dayton, Wyo. (H. Rept. 2127).
 - H. R. 12840, without amendment, to provide a single acreage allotment for Va. sun-cured and Va. fire-cured tobaccos if farmers vote approval in a referendum (H. Rept. 2128).
7. INFORMATION; LIBRARIES. The House Administration Committee reported without amendment H. R. 13140, to provide for distribution of additional types of Government publications to depository libraries and to provide for designation of additional depository libraries (H. Rept. 2136). p. 12086
8. FISH AND WILDLIFE. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee ordered reported the following bills: (p. D654)
 - H. R. 13138, with amendment, to amend the Coordination Act so as to provide more effective integration of fish and wildlife conservation programs with Federal water development programs.
 - S. 2617, with amendment, to authorize the purchase by the Secretary of the Interior of wetlands and small areas for migratory bird sanctuaries from funds collected from the sale of Migratory Bird hunting stamps.
 - S. 2447, with amendment, to authorize studies by Interior of the effects of insecticides upon fish and wildlife.
 - H. R. 10244, with amendment, to reaffirm the national policy regarding fish and wildlife resources.
9. INSPECTION SERVICES. A subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee ordered reported S. 3873, to authorize the interchange of inspection services between executive agencies without reimbursement or transfer of lands. p. D653
10. EDUCATION. Rep. Haskell inserted a letter from the President expressing his support for enactment of "a sound educational bill." p. 12040
Received from the U. S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange a report on the educational exchange activities (H. Doc. 419). p. 12085
11. SMALL BUSINESS. Received the conference report on H. R. 7963, to make the Small Business Administration a permanent agency and to increase the SBA loan authority (H. Rept. 2135). pp. 12041-43
12. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Debated H. R. 13015, to authorize construction at military installations, including authorization for financing from the foreign currencies acquired under Public Law 480 or through other commodity transactions of CCC. pp. 12043, 12044-74
13. PERSONNEL. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of S. 1411, to give agencies discretion in either suspending or retaining on duty a Federal employee prior to security hearings. p. 12043
14. ATOMIC ENERGY. Rep. Bailey spoke in opposition to provisions of the proposed Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill which would accelerate the development of atomic reactors. pp. 12074-77
The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 13121, the Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill. p. 12043

is the same as the authority conferred upon SBA by amendment No. 16 with respect to RFC loans transferred to it under that Reorganization Plan. The House recedes.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINE,
GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
JACKSON E. BETTS,

Managers on the Part of the House

AUTHORIZING MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 617 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 13015, the military construction authorization bill. The resolution provides for an open rule and 2 hours of general debate.

The total amount authorized is \$1,762,904,000; \$732,071,000 is authorized for the Army; of this amount approximately 63 percent is for the guided-missile program—the surface-to-air missile program, including logistic support facilities, and research and development and training facilities. In addition, \$30,847,000 is authorized to defray deficiencies in authorizations previously granted because of the general rise in construction costs throughout the world.

The Navy is authorized \$319,048,000 for new public works and \$15,825,000 for deficiencies in authorizations. A major part of the funds are to be used to modernize the Navy's Shore Establishment and to replace obsolescent and deteriorated facilities.

The Air Force authorization is \$957,372,000 for construction of new facilities at 160 major installations, plus facilities at sites for strategic defense and tactical missiles, off-base navigational aids, aircraft control and warning system sites. Also, \$4,372,000 is authorized for the Air Force Academy and \$13,411,000 for increased authorizations for prior years' projects for a total of \$975,155,000.

Fifty million dollars is authorized for the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense. The bill authorizes a total of 53,904 family hous-

ing units to be developed either under the Capehart and surplus commodity programs or military construction, plus another 9,374 units to be acquired under the Wherry housing program. The authorization for Reserve component facilities is \$30,958,000.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 617 so the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 13015 for which ample time has been provided.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Did the Committee on Rules give any particular attention to section 110 of this bill, which provides for the moving of an ordnance depot from near Houston, Tex., to somewhere in Alabama at a cost to the taxpayers of more than \$44 million?

Mr. MADDEN. The committee did not give any special attention to that particular phase of it, but no doubt it will be brought out in debate on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Indiana explained so ably, House Resolution 617 makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 13015, the so-called military construction authorization bill, with 2 hours of general debate. It is an open rule which will permit amendments.

This legislation, and the report thereon, are quite voluminous and quite detailed. The bill, if my recollection serves me correctly, authorizes the expenditure of over \$1.7 billion for military construction of different types in different sections of the country for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and their military installations.

A great part of the funds involved in this legislation would be for the construction of new military housing. This is a measure I feel should be explained rather thoroughly, and I am sure it will be by the members of the Committee on Armed Services. It does involve, as I have said, the expenditure of a great deal of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF EMPLOYMENT OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL IN THE INTEREST OF NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. MADDEN (on behalf of Mr. COLMER) from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 624, Rept. No. 2123), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, that upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that, the House resolve itself into the Committee

of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1411) to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. MADDEN (on behalf of Mr. O'NEILL) from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 625, Rept. No. 2124), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13121) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking House minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PROMOTING BOATING SAFETY ON NAVIGABLE WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 626, Rept. No. 2125), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11078) to promote boating safety on the navigable waters of the United States, its Territories, and possessions; to provide coordination and cooperation with the States in the interest of uniformity of boating laws; and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been

~~adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.~~

AUTHORIZE CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13015), with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill is known as the military Construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1959.

The grand total of all authorities granted in the bill is \$1,762,904,000.

This total is made up of a number of elements, two of which are new in this year's bill. This grand total of \$1,762,904,000 is broken down into its six elements as follows:

Army, \$332,071,000.

Navy, \$319,048,000.

Air Force, \$957,372,000.

Department of Defense—for the Advanced Research Projects Agency, \$50 million.

Deficiency authorizations, \$64,455,000.

Construction for the Reserve components—armories and Reserve facilities, \$39,958,000.

Now, this construction bill, of course, is a reflection of the size of our Armed Forces. This year, it is based on 870,000 men in the Army, 864 ships in the Navy, and 105 wings in the Air Force authorized for June 30, 1959.

Each of the services has its physical plant requirement which, together with the men and the weapons, makes up the total of our defense. The physical plant is an absolutely essential part of the defense structure and it must be improved, added to, and kept modern all of the time.

Now, a bill of this kind has its origin in the requests made by the field establishments of the three services. It is then submitted through channels to the particular military department headquarters in Washington. That department reviews it and it is finally submitted to the Secretary of the military department for his approval. The program then goes to the Secretary of Defense, and specifically to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations, a position now very competently held by Mr. Floyd S. Bryant.

Mr. Bryant's job is to review and coordinate all of the military construction

programs, making certain, for example, that facilities of one service that are not now being used to full capacity be used by another service. This office takes the overall view of the total construction program.

Following this process this year from a dollar standpoint, the picture is this: the field offices of the three departments made requests for construction totaling over two and a quarter billion dollars. Each of the three services cut this sum and the Secretary of Defense's office cut it further. So that we have before us a bill as I described it above.

This year the field requests of the three military departments totaled over two and a quarter billion dollars. The bill as submitted to the committee for the three military departments was \$1,634,000,000. The committee reduced this by over \$25 million, but in view of the fact that the committee inserted language authorizing the construction of armories in the amount of \$40 million, it makes the total of the bill approximately \$15 million more than asked for by the departments.

The two new elements injected into this bill, which I mentioned, are an authority in the amount of \$50 million for the Advanced Research Projects Agency and almost \$40 million for construction of armories and Reserve facilities for all of our Reserve components. Neither of these has appeared in a military construction bill before this year.

The bill represents some 2,800 individual items, not counting the Reserve construction or the Advanced Research Projects Agency. These line items are carried in what are called backup books and I have brought one of those books—only one of them—to the floor today in order that the House can have some idea of the amount of detailed study which goes into one of these bills. This particular book has 111 pages and is only 1 of 9 books.

Obviously, it would be impossible to go into any great detail with respect to a program of this size on the floor of the House. Indeed, it would take as long for me to explain it on the floor as it took the committee to study it during its hearings. I will, therefore, deal with some of the highlights of the program in order to make the general picture clear to the Members of the House.

For example, some \$545 million of construction in this bill is directly in support of our missile programs; about \$230 million is for expanded radar defense systems; \$208 million is for improving the capabilities of our Strategic Air Command; and \$178 million is for research and development, antimissile, missiles, and facilities needed for outer space projects. Understand, none of this authority is for missiles themselves or for other equipment. It is all for construction.

These elements of the program alone make up 80 percent of the total construction for the three military departments.

Before looking at the highlights of the programs for the three military departments, let me point out one important matter which goes directly to the question of construction costs, and that is

the fact that 94 percent of all of the construction contracts let by the military departments are on a bid basis. The competition is strong and the prospective contractors are using their sharpest pencils to get the work. To my mind, there is no greater assurance of getting a dollar's worth of construction for a dollar spent than this bid process.

ARMY

Let us look first at the Army program: Almost 40 percent of the Army program, or over \$137 million, is for construction of NIKE, Hawk, and Missile Master facilities; 11 percent is for permanent barracks, messes, and administrative and supply buildings for almost 11,000 enlisted men; 9 percent, or \$31 million, is for classified facilities in overseas areas. All of the other percentages are relatively small and cover, for the most part, improvements and additions to existing installations.

NAVY

For the Navy, almost 20 percent is devoted to research, development, and test facilities, many of them classified items and some of them relating to Polaris facilities. Over 14 percent is for operational, communications, and depot facilities to support the needs of the expanding submarine and antisubmarine operations. Over 13 percent is for various training facilities. And I might say that training facilities in all of our military services are more important today than they have ever been before. Changing weapons systems and changing concepts of warfare make up-to-date training absolutely necessary at all times.

Almost 13 percent of the Navy program is for the housing of our enlisted personnel. Again, the other percentages are relatively small and represent for the most part the continued improvement of naval facilities.

AIR FORCE

The percentage distribution of the Air Force program is more widespread than the other services, although the amounts of money are substantial in each case. You will note that the Air Force program is more than both the Army and the Navy program together.

Almost 18 percent of the Air Force program is devoted to the dispersal of units of the Strategic Air Command; 17 percent is for the construction of facilities for ballistic missiles; 13 percent is devoted to construction in support of our aircraft, control, and warning stations in the United States, Alaska, and Canada. And over 12 percent relates to construction for the BOMARC missile at various locations within the United States.

The rest of the Air Force program is made up of troop housing for enlisted personnel, maintenance facilities, extension of the Distant Early Warning Line and numerous other additions and improvements to existing bases.

So those are the highlights of the construction programs of the three departments. I would now like to deal briefly with items which are always of interest to the House and those are land acquisition, new bases in the program, and family housing for our military people.

LAND

I am happy to say that land acquisition in this program is the smallest in many years. The Army, for example, needs only about 4,000 acres; the Navy, a little over 1,000; and the Air Force, 2,000 acres. Of course, some additional relatively small parcels of land will be required from time to time for aircraft control and warning sites, strategic missiles, and other similar activities. These particular acquisitions cannot be anticipated with any great accuracy in advance but they should not add any great amount of land to the amounts which I have just referred to.

Speaking of land, we hear so often about the tremendous areas of land in the United States under the control of the military, and it is quite true that they do use and occupy vast areas in the United States. In my own opinion, the land used by the military is necessary for their proper functioning and is not excessive.

It is true that disposals of land can be made here and there and, indeed, are being made every day. Illustrative of this is the fact that between August of 1955 and April of 1958, a total of 469 installations, or portions of them, constituting over 1,800,000 acres were determined to be excess to the needs of the Department. Currently, an additional 4½ million acres of land are being studied within the Department with the idea that they, too, will be disposed of.

The military departments today occupy, in various fashions, about 27 million acres in the United States, of which only 7½ million acres have been removed from tax rolls. Their total land use is equivalent to only 1.4 percent of the total land area of the United States. And over half of the land under military control is from the public domain and has never been on the tax rolls. In any event, as indicated above, the additional acquisitions this year are extremely small and this is very gratifying.

While on the subject of land, I might point out that this year's bill, as submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, contained a provision which would repeal the law which would require the military departments to come into agreement with the Armed Services Committee on acquisitions or disposals involving more than \$25,000. The committee feels that this is a wise safeguard and struck from the bill the repealing language. So the committee will still have the opportunity to review these matters.

NEW BASES

Again, I am happy to inform you that there are no truly new bases in the program. There are, of course, some new radar stations and other minor facilities of this kind but there are no new bases of a substantial nature in the program.

FAMILY HOUSING

The family housing program is going very well both from the standpoint of constructing new family housing and the acquisition of Wherry housing projects. This bill contains a total of 53,904 units with 11,008 for the Army, 8,851 for

the Navy, and 34,045 for the Air Force.

Only 935 of this total will be built with appropriated funds. Most of the remaining houses will be constructed under the Capehart program. And overseas, 6,673 houses will be constructed under the surplus agriculture commodities program.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there are 95,000 housing units in this bill?

Mr. VINSON. There are 53,904 housing units; 11,008 for the Army, 8,815 for the Navy, and 34,045 for the Air Force. Except for 935 built under direct appropriation and 6,673 surplus commodity houses, these units are built under what is known as the Capehart Act.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have a breakdown of the housing units to be built outside of Continental United States?

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will examine the bill he will get that information. The bill requires line items for the housing. Indeed, I will state to the committee that the law requires that no houses may be built inside the country or overseas except by line item.

While on the subject of housing, I would like to point out that the bill this year contains a line item for every family housing unit which is going to be constructed. This is the result of last year's law which requires that no housing of any kind can be built or acquired after June 30, 1958, unless it has been supported by a specific line item in the military construction bill. So you can see where all of these houses are going to be built by a reference to H. R. 13015.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

I mentioned briefly the great number of individual items in this bill—2,800 of them. The bill you have before you is, of course, a clean bill which shows only a very small number of last-minute amendments, some of them merely corrective amendments.

The bill which the committee held its hearings on was amended by the committee in 115 instances. And these 115 amendments represent only those which could be seen on the face of the bill. At least this same number of additional amendments were made internally in the various sections of the bill but did not appear individually other than as a single change in a money figure. One of these amendments, I recall, involved 22 internal changes in a classified portion of the bill. This illustrates the precise and detailed consideration which the committee gives to a bill of this kind.

Many—indeed, most—of the changes which I have referred to were modifications of items submitted by the departments. In a few instances, the committee added items which, in their best judgment, should be in the program but were not included in it for various reasons with which the committee did not agree. I might say at this point that although the committee in great part is offering to the House a program which represents the requests of the military

departments, it still is highly aware and sensitive to the fact that in the last analysis, it is Congress who raises and supports our military force and writes into the law the items which it thinks the Congress should provide for our Armed Forces.

I would like to enumerate briefly the matters which the committee inserted in the program.

FORT HUACHUCA, ARIZ.

The first of these is the addition of the second increment of a technical building at Fort Huachuca, Ariz. I will not go into great detail about any of these items but this is, perhaps, a typical one. The first half of this building, which performs a highly classified function, is just being completed at this time. The Army had the second half of the building in its program last year and again this year, but each time, because of budgetary limitations, the second half of the building failed to survive the reviews of the various echelons within the Department and at the Bureau of the Budget. So the committee in its best judgment inserted this item and hopes that appropriations will be made in order that this important facility can be completed at the earliest possible date.

NAVAL SHIPYARD, CHARLESTON, S. C.

Another item added by the committee was authority to construct a drydock at a cost of \$10 million in Charleston, S. C. The Navy conceded that the existing drydocks at Charleston are not capable of accommodating the new ballistic missile submarines. And since this type of submarine will operate from this area, it is essential that all facilities necessary for its operation be provided in timely fashion.

Also, at Charleston, S. C., the committee inserted authority in the amount of \$10,300,000 for classified facilities directly related to the ballistic missile submarine. I cannot go into detail about these, suffice it to say that recent developments made this item particularly necessary at this time. The Navy was in full agreement with the committee's action, and I believe it can be safely said that there is little argument about the decision of the committee with respect to the addition of this construction.

NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR STATION, KINGSVILLE, TEX.

At the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Tex., the committee added \$1,041,000 to construct two barracks for 504 enlisted men. The existing barracks were built at the beginning of World War II with a 5-year life. They have long outlived their usefulness and this is only a small step toward furnishing our enlisted people with reasonable and livable quarters.

NAVAL AIR STATION, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

For the Naval Air Station, San Diego, Calif., the committee inserted authority in the amount of \$7 million for the construction of a new marginal wharf and for dredging in that area. Today, the *Forrestal*-type carrier is assigned for service in the Pacific, but the existing harbor entrance channel is too shallow

to accommodate these carriers. Also, there is not in the San Diego area a wharf of sufficient size and equipment with adequate utilities to berth, refuel, and service this type of carrier. Activities in the San Diego area relating to this class of carrier are now both expensive and, on occasion, extremely dangerous.

NAVAL SHIPYARD, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

The subsidence of the Naval Shipyard at Long Beach, Calif., has a long history which I will not detail now. Suffice it to say that the shipyard at one point has sunk 17 feet. The apparent cause of this subsidence is the withdrawal of oil from the Wilmington oilfield. Over the years, the Navy has been granted authorities to build protective works to keep the ocean out of the shipyard. Action taken by this committee last year resulted in legislation being passed by the State of California to correct this subsidence. As an encouragement to this forward-looking program, the committee authorized \$6 million for protective works for what it hopes to be the last protective works for this shipyard in which we have an investment of \$65 million—and a replacement cost of \$140 million. Only \$500,000 of this \$6 million, however, can be used until the Secretary of the Navy in his judgment is satisfied that the State and local authorities and the oil companies have taken effective action to prevent further subsidence.

SCHOOL OF AVIATION MEDICINE, BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

A rather large authority added by the committee was one for the School of Aviation Medicine at Brooks Air Force Base, Tex. This school is probably the only school of its kind in the whole world. Unfortunately, it has had a rather unhappy history from a construction and facilities standpoint since its inception. While the operations carried on there—such as the recent simulated trip to the moon—are of great interest and of even greater importance to our country as we move forward into extremely high speeds within the atmosphere, and out into space, the construction items for a facility of this kind seem always to fall out of a program along the way and are replaced by items of, shall we say, a more immediately practical nature. Well, in my opinion, we need the runways and the barracks but we also need to keep our eye fixed far into the future. And there never has been a time in the history of the world when this has been more important. Some \$9 million has already been authorized for this school and it has been functioning under restricted conditions for many years. Always it seems that budget limitations or higher priorities have caused this school to suffer in the authorization bill. And for this reason, the committee decided this year to take the bull by the horns and insert this most important construction authority in the bill. We would not dare fall behind in this field and I fear that we may well fall behind unless we give our military people the research tools that are so necessary.

BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE, LA.

Another item for barracks was added at Barksdale Air Force Base, La. This

is an important Strategic Air Command base and it, like the installation in Texas to which I referred briefly, has World War II barracks which simply are not fit for habitation. The \$925,000 added at this installation will be another small step in providing proper facilities for our enlisted airmen.

SECTION 110 (SAN JACINTO ORDNANCE DEPOT, TEX.)

The last item I would like to refer to is an authority granted by the committee which appears as section 110 in the Army title. Actually, this is more than an authority. This is a specific direction to the Army to move the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot from its present location on the Houston ship channel to an isolated area known as Point-Aux-Pins in Alabama.

The department took the position that the Point-Aux-Pins facility would only be built in the event of total mobilization. The great industrial centers of Houston, Tex., is very anxious that this hazardous depot at San Jacinto be removed from its area. There are some 40 million pounds of high explosives there.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The record of the hearings show there are 80,000 tons.

Mr. VINSON. Yes; 80,000 tons. I thank the gentleman. That is a large amount. That is 80,000 tons. That 80,000 tons keeps the people in that area a little bit disturbed when they hear a loud clap of thunder because they fear it might be the beginning of the rumble of the explosion of—how many tons did you say?

Mr. GROSS. Eighty thousand tons.

Mr. VINSON. Yes; 80,000 tons.

The Point-Aux-Pins facility was authorized in the amount of \$26 million some years ago. The depot has never been built since it represented only a mobilization requirement. Indeed, the land has never been acquired for the Point-Aux-Pins facility.

Now, the depot in Houston was built there a number of years ago and covers about 5,000 acres. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] appeared before the Armed Services Committee and contended in most forceful fashion that this depot should be moved on two bases: the first of these is that the facility constitutes a danger to the area surrounding it and second, it is now located on land so valuable for industrial development as to make it wholly unfair and improper to let it remain in its present location. The committee, after deliberation, inserted language in the bill which will require the movement of this depot, as I say, to a new location.

It is difficult to give exact figures of the cost involved since the Government will undoubtedly recover a large sum when it sells the property at the present location. Suffice it to say that from the standpoint of the bill, the committee increased the authorization for the Point-Aux-Pins facility from \$26 million to \$44 million, the \$44 million representing the cost of constructing the replacement facility.

Now, that is the construction bill for fiscal year 1959. I agree that I have dealt with only the highlights of the bill but I trust that I have given the Members of the House a picture sufficiently broad to warrant their support of this important legislation.

If we are to have a Defense Establishment, we must have facilities for that establishment. And that is all that this bill does. It provides the essential construction items needed to provide a base from which our forces can fight both here and overseas.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How far is the city of Houston from this ordnance depot?

Mr. VINSON. About 15 miles.

Mr. GROSS. There seems to be quite a little variation according to the testimony brought out before your committee.

Mr. VINSON. There are a great number of buildings in that area, and there are numerous oil refineries and great chemical plants all down this channel.

Mr. GROSS. As a matter of fact, there is a chemical plant now; is there not?

Mr. VINSON. The committee has not been interested in anything but the ordnance depot itself. I did not think there was anything much there except ammunition.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services a question concerning the hazards relative to air traffic control.

I notice that in this bill you continue the expansion of the program for the construction of the Richard I. Bong Air Force Base in Wisconsin. Originally it was the Strategic Air Command base but now it has become a bomber base and it is located between two of the busiest airports in the world, Chicago Midway and Milwaukee, Wis. It is 45 miles from each of these 2 important civilian fields, and I call the gentleman's attention to the consideration the committee gave to the safety aspects of the location of this particular base.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I may say to our distinguished friend who made this inquiry that all of these locations were cleared with the CAA and with the Air Panel of the Defense Department.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. As the Chairman knows, I have introduced a bill requesting that the Port Chicago Naval Magazine in California be relocated in a safer area at Tubbs Island, Sonoma County, Calif. This bill was introduced at the request of the port supervisor of Contra Costa County, Calif., in which the Port Chicago Naval Magazine is located.

As the chairman knows, there has been a great deal of feeling in the Port Chicago area because of the great loss of life that occurred there in World War II

and because of the tremendous increase in population and industry of the area. The people in that community are very anxious to have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. VINSON. I am sure the gentleman knows the attitude of the committee. The committee feels that this country is large enough to have these installations in areas where there is no danger from these high explosives. It is hazardous, as the gentleman mentioned, to have such installations in industrial areas. The gentleman will probably remember some 25 or 30 years ago when we established the first naval depot it was transferred from Kokomo, which had become a thickly populated area, to Hawthorne, Nev. The policy has been to put them in remote sections of the country.

Take the situation of this channel, this estuary at Houston. It is a hazard and a risk to an enormous amount of shipping that uses that waterway. Of course the people are disturbed. If we did not have remote areas where such installations could be placed, with safety to all concerned, it might be necessary to leave them in these congested areas. The sensible thing, however, is to put them out in another place that the Government found. That is the commonsense thing to do. We should sell the present property and get as much for it as we possibly can, not give it away. In that connection I want to say I am proud of their record made in the sale of property by the General Services Administration and the amount of money we are receiving for it. I just today examined the figures. In a great many instances we receive 40 to 50 percent of the total amount invested by the Government when we sell this property.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Were there any mass meetings held in Houston, Tex., in opposition to the establishment of this ordnance plant?

Mr. VINSON. I do not know. That was not taken up by the Committee on the Armed Services.

Mr. GROSS. Back in 1942 was there any opposition to the establishment of this ordnance plant there?

Mr. VINSON. I would say no. They are like every community in the country, they wanted to get a military installation.

Mr. GROSS. They were tickled to death to get it?

Mr. VINSON. It is like a great many of these people who wanted air bases. They want them now. But when these jets come flying over them and disturb everybody they want to get rid of them. The only people that I know of that have not wanted to get rid of the base are the people near Grandview, Mo.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and that brings me to this question.

Mr. VINSON. Yes, I knew it would bring the gentleman to some question.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure there must be an appropriation in here for the Truman Airport.

Mr. VINSON. We have given it a new name.

Mr. GROSS. What is the new name?

Mr. VINSON. Let me see.

Mr. GROSS. That is very interesting.

Mr. VINSON. We took the name "Grandview" away from it and gave it the name of two outstanding officers from that community who were killed. It is now called Richards-Gebaur.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. May I invite the attention of the chairman of the committee and the membership of the House to the fact that I intend to offer an amendment to strike section 110 of the bill relating to San Jacinto and put back the permissive language which was the original position of our committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. On behalf of the citizens of Port Chicago, can we ask that the committee arrange for early hearings?

Mr. VINSON. An early hearing in January? I am hoping we will get through this session very soon and it will not be necessary to have many more meetings.

Mr. BALDWIN. You will have a hearing in January, then?

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mrs. HARDEN. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman if there is new construction contained in this bill?

Mr. VINSON. Of course all of it is new construction in one sense. There are no new bases in the broadest sense that we use the term "new bases." It may be necessary to buy some Nike sites and that type of installation. There will be a few.

Mrs. HARDEN. I am interested because in 1957 the Dana plant in my congressional district was closed, and I was wondering if the distinguished chairman and his committee gave any consideration to using the facilities of that plant.

Mr. VINSON. That, I believe, is an industrial plant and would not be involved in this bill. I am sorry to say we did not go into that. I can assure you, however, that the Department does give close study to see if present facilities can be used and eliminate the need of establishing new ones. No doubt you have just read in the paper where the Committee on Armed Services is now making an investigation to see if Indian Head can be used to its full extent instead of going out and building a new facility. Those matters are sometimes considered by us in the study of a bill of this kind.

Mrs. HARDEN. I hope the gentleman and his committee will give considera-

tion to using the facilities of the Dana plant.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I should like to inquire about an item which appears on page 5 of the bill providing for the authorization of \$144,000 to acquire land in Baywood Park, Calif. I have considerable doubt in my mind whether it is necessary that this land be acquired. I am engaged in developing some additional facts at this time. I would like to have the assurance of the chairman if possibly I do develop other facts we can have another consideration?

Mr. VINSON. Yes. They are required, in addition to the authorization, to come before the Committee on Armed Services of the House and Senate for the acquisition of each tract of land in here, with a complete breakdown and detailed explanation. I will keep this matter open.

RESERVE COMPONENTS

Mr. Chairman, I have not dealt in any detail with title VI of this bill which involves about \$40 million of construction for the Reserve components. I am going to ask that this matter be covered by the true expert on this subject, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]. He has been in this area of legislation for many years and I feel that his remarks on the subject will not only give a comprehensive picture of this portion of the bill but will have the added dignity of coming from a man who has had as his first interest in the Congress, the creation, maintenance, and advancement of the Reserve components of the United States.

I urge every Member of this House to support this bill. I can assure you that the bill you have before you today is a sound one and represents not only the best thinking of the military and civilian people within the Department of Defense, but also the considered judgment of the 37 members of the Armed Services Committee.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, just about all the facts and figures relating to this bill have been given by the chairman of the committee. And others that are speaking on this bill are directing their remarks to particular parts of the program which are of special interest to them.

I have had, as Members of the House know, a strong and abiding interest in our Army and ground forces, particularly in the foot soldier who, in the last analysis, does most of the drab, dangerous, and frequently terrific fighting.

By this I would not wish to indicate for a moment that I do not wholeheartedly support this whole bill. It is a well thought out one, and one which received the closest scrutiny by the committee during its deliberations.

As usual, of course, we had the fine leadership of our chairman, who, by his

work over a long period of years, has earned and, as I have said in the past, richly deserves, the hearty commendation and respect of the membership on both sides of the aisle.

Indeed, I might say that this particular construction program finds much of its soundness in his able leadership and direction.

I would like to speak at this moment on the Army portion of the program, and I would like to conclude my remarks with a discussion of the several types of family housing which we are providing for all of our military personnel, since I believe that this constitutes one of the most important contributions which the Congress can make to the morale and well-being of our fighting forces.

The Army's construction authorization request for fiscal year 1959, as contained in title I of H. R. 13015, totals \$332,071,000. The title also authorizes family housing to be obtained through funds generated by the sale of surplus agricultural commodities and through the provisions of the Capehart Housing Act.

In view of the state of world affairs today and the responsibilities shouldered by the United States, this request is as modest as the mission of the Army will permit. Initiated within a fixed and rigid budget ceiling, reviewed exhaustively and painstakingly by the Department of Defense, by the Executive Office of the President and by the Congress, this request is the minimum that can logically be expected to provide construction support for the operational and mission type responsibilities of the Army and for the long-range requirements of that service.

The principal tasks of our Army today include but are not limited to: the overseas deployment of forces for the deterrence of aggression and prompt intervention in the event of limited or general war; the maintenance of a mobile combat-ready strategic force here at home for the rapid reinforcement of forward deployed forces; and the provision of forces as required for the defense of the United States against air attack.

Our overseas forces constitute our first line of defense and, in conjunction with the other services and with our allies, have the mission of deterring aggression. If aggression occurs, these forces must accomplish essential tasks to allow time for reinforcement. The Army has earmarked 12 percent of its total construction request to support this mission of deterrence.

The heart of our strategic force here at home is the Strategic Army Corps. This corps consists of 4 combat-ready divisions and supporting troops prepared to meet the initial requirements of limited war, or, in the event of general war, to provide immediate reinforcements for our forces now deployed overseas. The Army has included 1.1 percent of its present request to meet urgent requirements of this corps.

The third major mission of the Army is its contribution to the air defense of the United States. The Army has earmarked 48.3 percent of the program to provide and construct sites for the tactical

deployment of our surface-to-air missiles, to construct logistic support facilities for the tactical forces, and to insure adequate facilities for training the men who are to man the weapons.

In addition to the requirements of our deterrent forces in being, I would like to point out three other objectives of the Army's construction program that should be noted. These objectives are: first, the effort to support guided-missile research and development, testing and training; second, the continued program to provide proper facilities for the Army's aviation; and, third, the construction of permanent-type facilities in the United States and its possessions to provide essential, more efficient, and more effective facilities as obsolescence and high maintenance costs dictate the replacement of World War I and World War II temporary facilities or whenever additional construction is necessary to support new long-range missions or increased operational demands.

To support the Army's total guided-missile effort, including both surface-to-air and surface-to-surface, 63 percent of the program is devoted. Working within such an austere and rigid budgetary framework as was imposed this fiscal year, the Army has spent every dollar possible to insure that time, effort, and money will result in maximum returns. Husbinding the resources made available by the Congress and in spite of rigid fiscal restrictions and dishearteningly low priorities, the Army has achieved truly outstanding results for our national defense. It has launched the first United States satellite. It has recently recovered the nose cone of a Jupiter that was fired 1,500 miles through space—a remarkable feat that had not been accomplished heretofore. This feat has indicated to the world that we have the advanced propulsion, guidance, and materiel components for long-range missiles. This feat, I am sorry to say, has received all too little recognition even in our own press.

In the field of Army aviation, the sky cavalry of today, a vital arm in the modern Army designed to provide the ground forces with the organic aviation so necessary to accomplish its mission, the Army has earmarked 2.5 percent of its authorization request. This increment continues the program of making adequate aviation facilities available as soon as possible within present stringent budget limitations.

The long-range Army requires facilities that increase the efficiency of its operations and decrease the high maintenance costs of the inadequate temporary structures inherited from our past wars and emergencies. To replace old structures or make available new facilities, the Army embarked in fiscal year 1954 on an evaluation program of its overall physical plant. This program includes operational and training facilities, troop and family housing, maintenance, supply and community support facilities, and utilities. A time target goal of 20 years was established—the time within which new permanent structures should be phased in to replace present tempo-

rary structures, which would have far surpassed their normal life expectancy.

This permanent plant program has received the most careful planning. To insure that temporary facilities are used to their maximum economical and efficient life, careful analyses are made of available plant, the functions it must perform and the effects of this plant on operations, costs, and morale. To preclude any possibility of overbuilding in new permanent plant category, the Army plans and programs for this type of construction at a level safely below its long-range or current strength, whichever is smaller, and at only those posts which have been designated permanent and are, beyond any reasonable doubt, necessary to the accomplishment of the Army's long-range mission. However, as has been stated by the Honorable Dewey Short, Assistant Secretary of the Army, with 25 percent of the 20 years already passed, less than 18 percent of the total objective has been accomplished. Within military budget limitations, high priority mission and operational-type projects must and have taken precedence over the longer range objective of more efficient and adequate facilities and quarters for our troops. Since austerity is the keynote, the Army has been compelled in many cases to keep men living and working in facilities far below the standards acceptable in everyday life. Thirty and five-tenths percent of the present authorization request involves permanent-type structures.

As I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, I have had for a number of years a strong interest in the provision of family housing for our military people. It is my opinion that we should leave nothing undone to provide satisfactory housing for all our military families.

I have noted on occasion that some Members of the House—and I might say, quite understandably—do not have any precise picture of the manner in which or the extent to which we provide family housing for our military. Nor, in my opinion, is there a sufficient understanding of the magnitude of their requirements. With this in mind, I would like to direct the attention of the Members to pages 35 and 36 of the committee report. On those pages are set out the magnitude of the need for family housing, the number of existing units, and the deficit. What is not set out in the report are the details as to how this housing is provided.

In addition to the privately owned family units throughout the country and, indeed, throughout the world which are used by our military personnel, there are five different kinds of housing which are provided in various fashions which I will detail.

The first of these is the most readily understandable and that is the so-called appropriated fund housing. This housing is built after authorization by the Congress and the appropriation of funds. It is constructed under standard military construction procedures and the completed housing is operated as public quarters, public quarters meaning nothing more or less than that the service-

man who occupies the housing surrenders his housing allowance.

Title VIII—Capehart housing: This housing is built following competitive bidding pursuant to authorization by a military construction authorization act and the builder is paid from a 100 percent mortgage loan insured by FHA and guaranteed by the military department. The completed housing is operated as public quarters and here also each military occupant forfeits his basic allowance for quarters. Pursuant to the guaranty, the military department pays off the mortgage loan and interest thereon by monthly payments over a 25-year period.

Wherry housing: This housing was built following competitive bidding in accordance with provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to August 11, 1955. In most cases the housing was built on Government-owned land by a private sponsor who contracted to operate the housing as private rental units under a leasehold from the military; the cost of construction was financed by an FHA-insured mortgage which could not exceed 90 percent of the estimated replacement cost.

When a Capehart project is built at or near a Wherry project, the military must acquire the Wherry housing; the military may acquire such housing even though no Capehart project is nearby. Such acquisitions are accomplished by negotiation or condemnation pursuant to statutory provisions; the military pays the sponsor for his equity, makes payments on the existing mortgage, and operates the housing as public quarters. Equity payments, amortization payments, and immediate repairs and improvements to acquired projects, are paid from the Wherry revolving fund; maintenance and operation costs are covered by separate appropriations.

Surplus commodity: Under this program, foreign currencies are generated through country-to-country agreements covering the sale of surplus agricultural commodities. A portion of the funds generated are set aside for the payment of construction costs of United States military family housing. In some cases, such as the United Kingdom and Japan, the local currency has been adequate to meet all costs. In others, however, such as Spain and Morocco, the local currency has been supplemented by appropriated dollars—up to a limit of 25 percent of the total cost—in order to obtain scarce items not available locally.

The occupants of this housing forfeit their quarters allowances which are used, first, to pay maintenance and operating costs, and, second, to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the foreign currencies used.

One important advantage of the surplus commodity program is that the quarters allowances are used to repay the Commodity Credit Corporation, so that there is no outflow of gold from the United States.

Rental guaranty program: The rental guaranty program provides housing in foreign countries, built with foreign capital and owned by foreign investors, without the requirement of any capital in-

vestment on the part of the United States.

Under this program some 4,800 units of housing were constructed in France during the period from 1953 to 1955 and additional projects have been constructed in Morocco and Spain. The selected builders are guaranteed a specified level of income for a certain period of years, usually 5 to 7 years, as an incentive to construct the required houses. Military families have first right of occupancy of these units at specified rentals and, if the guaranteed level of occupancy—95 percent is maintained, the United States incurs no cost other than the payment of quarters allowances to the individuals.

I would like to return to the Army again to speak briefly with respect to the family housing which is provided for them in the bill.

This bill authorizes the construction of 158 units of appropriated fund housing, 934 units of surplus-commodity-type housing in overseas temporary base rights areas, and 9,916 units of housing to be constructed in the United States and Hawaii under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act.

It should be noted that the appropriated fund housing is a reprogramming action using prior year's authorization and that no new dollar authorization is being requested. This, of course, is true of all appropriated fund housing in the bill. The housing in overseas temporary base rights areas will be built from local currencies arising from the sale of surplus commodities as I described.

The family housing to be authorized by this bill will still leave the Army with a program shortage of 31,000 units in the United States and possessions and a shortage of approximately 14,000 units overseas in temporary base right areas. Money invested in adequate housing will more than offset the substantial financial loss represented by the voluntary separation from service of highly trained personnel in whose training great amounts of money have been expended. The provision of adequate housing and the opportunity for normal family life is a basic factor in maintaining high morale and in the retention of skilled personnel in our services.

In summary, the construction authorization request for all three services in this bill is indeed austere. It has been limited primarily to essential mission and operational type facilities; it has been carefully and painstakingly assembled and will provide the American taxpayer with the results which he justifiably expects.

If each Member of the House had sat through the hearing day after day with me and the other members of the Armed Services Committee, he would give this bill the same kind of wholehearted support that I have indicated in my remarks. I can, therefore, in all sincerity ask that every Member of the House give his unqualified support to this important construction bill.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, the contents of this military public works bill have been very thoroughly discussed, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] will, I am sure, contribute substantially to the discussion. I shall not, therefore, attempt to add to the exposition that has been presented.

For the record, Mr. Chairman, I do want to take this opportunity to refer to one airbase for which this bill includes authorization, and give a brief description of the base, its history, and the outstanding training record that it has achieved through the years. I am referring to Laughlin Air Force Base, located at Del Rio, Tex.

This base occupies 4,192 acres of land in Val Verde County, Tex., approximately 7 miles east of the county seat at Del Rio, a community of 14,112 people, plus recent increases.

In 1942 construction began on the site of a ranch formerly owned by S. B. Harrison, of San Antonio, Tex. The installation was first occupied by military personnel in December 1942. The first base commander was Col. George Muncy. Construction continued after the base was occupied and by 1944 more than \$7 million had been expended on emergency war-base facilities.

The field was dedicated in March 1943, and named in honor of Lt. Jack Thomas Laughlin of Del Rio, Tex. Jack Thomas Laughlin was born in Del Rio, Tex., on September 17, 1914. He graduated from the University of Texas in 1938. Jack Laughlin entered into active service with the Air Corps in April 1941 and served admirably in the defense of our country until January 29, 1942. On that date he was killed in combat while flying a B-17 mission over Java. Lt. Jack Laughlin was the first World War II pilot casualty from Del Rio, Tex.

Throughout World War II, Laughlin Air Force Base, then known as Laughlin Army Air Field, was utilized as an advanced flying school for the training of B-26 pilots. The training program was instituted at Laughlin in February 1943, and during the period from February 1943 to October 1954, more than 2,200 B-26 pilots were trained there and dispatched to the war theaters.

After victory in 1945 and there being no longer a requirement for the installation, Laughlin Air Field was placed on inactive status and turned over to the Corps of Engineers. Later the land was leased for grazing.

With the Korean conflict, there was an immediate requirement to increase the pilot training program; so in May of 1952, the United States Air Force reopened the base as a single-engine aircraft training base. Under the 3645th combat crew training wing, whose mission was to conduct training in transition to jet aircraft and gunnery, the peak student load at reopened Laughlin came in May 1954 with 357 students.

Between fiscal years 1952 and 1956, approximately 10 million dollars was expended in construction of new facilities necessary to raise the base from World War II mobilization standards up to present Air Force standards necessary to

accommodate modern weapons and equipment.

There are three usable runways at Laughlin Air Force Base: An asphaltic concrete primary-instrument runway, 9,500 feet long by 150 feet wide; a parallel runway of asphaltic concrete, 7,500 feet long by 150 feet wide; and an asphaltic concrete cross-wind runway, 6,500 feet long by 150 feet wide.

The majority of the structures existing on base are semi-permanent type buildings constructed primarily in support of the Air Training Mission. The total base inventory value as of June 30, 1957, was approximately 17 million dollars.

In April of 1957 Laughlin Air Force Base was transferred from the Air Training Command to the jurisdiction of the Strategic Air Command. The mission now operating from Laughlin is one which is vitally important to the overall operational concept of the Strategic Air Command.

The Air Force proposes to expend \$897,000 during fiscal year 1959 for construction of operational, aircraft maintenance, and community facilities. Continued investments in future years are planned by the Air Force for improvement and expansion of the facilities required to support the important strategic mission at this base.

The present base military population is approximately 2,800 men. Approximately 260 civilians are employed at various jobs on the base. This situation is expected to continue with the planned use of Laughlin Air Force Base, Tex.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for his liberality in yielding me so much time. I do not, however, plan to use all of that time, and I shall yield back that which I do not use.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to say this. I was present and in attendance at practically every meeting of the full committee when it considered this measure. It was exhaustively considered line by line, item by item. I think the committee knows fully what is in this measure. It is a tedious job to take up line by line, to investigate, and appraise, and reach a judgment upon items presented one after the other in rapid succession in a bill of this character.

I was also chairman of the subcommittee that handled the reserve portion of this bill; that is, title VI. In fact, the distinguished chairman of the full committee appointed Subcommittee No. 1, which is the Reserve Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services to handle title VI separately inasmuch as it deals with the Reserve program. Our subcommittee entered into a full study of each and every feature, including the line items, covering the Reserve program, all of which are under title VI of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time this bill has had line items for the Reserve program. Heretofore we have

brought in a separate bill with a lump sum authorization, but last year the full committee in its wisdom investigated this matter and instructed the Department in the future to bring in for the Reserve program a line-by-line type of bill. This is what has happened this year. So title VI was turned over to the subcommittee to work out.

The whole Reserve construction program as we know it today began in the year 1950. Up until that time the meager funds that were appropriated for Reserve construction were handled in a more or less haphazard manner. As a matter of fact, prior to the 1950 bill practically all of the money came from items tucked away in the general appropriations bill that had no authorization prior to the enactment of the bill.

In 1950 we set to work to set up a definite program of Reserve installation construction. Public Law 783 of the 81st Congress is the result of our work in this respect.

Under the bill before the committee now each of the services presents their line items and they are approved by the committee and by the Congress of the United States.

Under Public Law 783 we provided for a joint user, that is, for the use of the installations by all of the services that need the installations.

We also provided under the act of 1950 for contributions for Army National Guard construction. The Army National Guard armories are built by a contributory payment of the States of 25 percent and the remainder, 75 percent of the cost of construction, is contributed by the Federal Government. This rule does not apply to nonarmory construction, even with the National Guard. In the nonarmory type of construction the Government still pays the full 100 percent. That is especially true in reference to the Air National Guard.

We began in 1950 authorizing under this law and today we have authorized a total sum of \$580 million for Reserve construction throughout the United States. We have Army Reserve construction in every State in the United States and also in our possessions. To this date we have expended in this program the sum of \$554.4 million. The projects totaling \$480 million have actually been constructed or are definitely planned for construction. In other words, this is the amount presently on hand and available for use in 1959 and in fiscal year 1960.

There is a residue of \$74 million. This residue of \$74 million can be broken down as follows: The Army National Guard has a residue available of \$17.7 million on hand. The Army Reserve has \$30.8 million, the Navy and the Marine Corps Reserve have \$10.8 million. The Air Force Reserve has \$15.1 million. The Air National Guard has no funds carried over whatsoever.

Perhaps, you will be interested in a brief explanation of the Reserve components which require the continued authorization of additional Reserve facilities. I am going to take them up briefly one by one.

For instance, we have the Navy surface program, which consists of 319 training centers and facilities. It also consists of 184 electronic facilities and stations.

A major effort is now underway to reorganize sizable segments of the Naval Reserve surface program to be cruise ready on short notice to man antisubmarine warfare ships for immediate augmentation of the fleet in the event of an emergency.

The Marine Corps Reserve program consists of 231 training centers belonging to the Marine Corps. One hundred and sixty-three of these are combined, however, with the Navy Reserve training centers under the joint user clause of the act of 1950. Although there are no additional centers now required, replacement, expansion, and modernization of some of the Marine Reserve centers will be needed in the future.

I want to take up at this point the Air Force Reserve and the Air Guard. Turn-in to this phase of the Reserve program, we find that the Air Force and the Reserve and the Air National Guard has the established mobilization requirement of 38 combat wings. Twenty-four of these wings, Mr. Chairman, consist of 83 combat squadrons of the fighter and tactical reconnaissance type making up the tactical forces of the Air National Guard. There are 15 medium troop carrier wings and 45 tactical squadrons of the Air Force Reserve. In addition, there are 157 support type units of the Air Reserve and the Air National Guard which have been programed to meet specific mobilization requirements in the field of communications, weather, air resupply, air evacuation, terminal operations, air rescue and hospital type units.

The Air National Guard consists of 93 flying bases and 41 nonflying bases. Certain construction is necessary to complete some of the newer facilities to replace the World War II temporary construction to expand some of the facilities, especially the runways, the taxiways and some of the aprons in order to accommodate some of the aircraft of higher performance than those used in the past.

The Air Reserve program has 34 flying bases now in operation with a good percentage of the minimum operational facilities required having been provided. There are three additional bases which still need it, and these are now under construction and will be completed during the fiscal year 1959.

In the Army National Guard Armory program, 960 of the 2,089 armories constructed have been paid for by the several States. In other words, just a few less than a thousand armories have been paid for by the States themselves.

We have a total requirement which varies from 2,250 armories to 2,780. You ask, Why do you say the requirement varies from 2,250 to 2,780? I answer that in the program and changeover to the new type of concept of defense the Defense Department contends that we will need only 2,250 armories of this character, whereas the National Guard contends that we will need 2,780 armories. This matter, however, will

be ironed out as we progress with the Reserve program and bring it down to a modernized condition. I can tell you that a total of 1,100 armories have been constructed, are under construction, or have been funded to date under this particular feature of the Reserve program.

Thus, the remaining requirement for National Guard armories ranges, as I said, from 234 armories to 764 armories, depending upon the modernized concept of the Reserve program as worked out by the Defense Department.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Is it my understanding that the armories which are provided for in this bill will be new ones in areas where none presently exist?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes. Of course, there will be some repairs, and there will be replacements in some instances; but, by and large, they will be in new locations, and the ones we provide for come from a list of priorities given us by the departments, that is, the Army, Navy, or Air Force, and the National Guard bureaus.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In other words, the ones that were included in the gentleman's bill were the ones that were given a sufficiently high priority by the Reserves or by the committee.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The committee itself did not establish priorities. The priorities came from the Pentagon and from the Defense Department.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. In the Army Reserve program it is estimated that a total of 1,850 armories are needed, in addition to the program of the National Guard. Only 385 of these have been constructed or are under construction at this time. Thus there is a remaining requirement for the Army Reserves of 1,083 centers. This requirement also may be subject to revision or implementation.

Our Reserve program is proceeding quite well, and I can tell this group here today this, that the Navy Reserve program should be completed within the next 2 years. It has reached the point that we can see the end of the Reserve construction program for the Navy.

For the Air Force the Reserve program is something like 85 percent complete. Our big deficiency lies in the field of the Army, the Army National Guard program, and the Army Reserve program. There considerable new construction is required; and, as I just said, the Army Reserve requires 1,083 new centers to complete their program.

The Department's legislative proposal which came to our committee provided for roughly \$30,140,000 in new construction. We went over this proposal very carefully. We find that under the proposal the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps would receive an authorization of \$11,892,000 under the proposals from the Pentagon.

We find that the Air Reserve would receive \$6,272,000, and the Air National Guard would receive \$11,976,000.

The committee was considerably disturbed because the proposal that came from the Department contained no request or authorization for the Army or the Army National Guard, yet the need of the country and the reserve program more than any other need is for construction in the Army National Guard.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. That is a point I would like to have cleared up. I have in my district an authorization for a National Guard armory and we are told that the funds have been used, that they are not on the priority list, or at least far enough on the priority list.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who I know is most sincere in his efforts in behalf of the defense program because I have worked with him for many years, it is not true that the funds have been consumed. Congress has appropriated money that has not been consumed by the Department or the Army National Guard. The gentleman referred to the Army National Guard. The Army National Guard has \$17.7 million funded and unobligated authorizations at the present time and the Army Reserve has \$30.8 million authorized and funded at this particular time. But that money has not been spent. Your committee has done its best to cause the proper orderly obligation of these funds toward the building of our program that we have sponsored in the past and adopted by the House.

Mr. FENTON. Do the various State authorities have any say at all in the selection of these priorities?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The priorities come from the States to the National Guard Bureau. The National Guard Bureau screens the priorities, then submits them to the Congress of the United States. In handling this we found that the funds are not finding their way down to the National Guard Bureau. The funds for the Army Reserve are not finding their way to the Army itself, therefore the Army and the National Guard Bureau have not been allowed to expend the funds which the Congress has provided in the past for this particular program. We think that money should have been spent.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I am sorry to interrupt, but this is of vital concern to me also. These funds which the gentleman referred to are earmarked for specific armories or are they earmarked for the over-all program?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They are earmarked for the over-all program. The National Guard Reserve construction program received a lump sum. The Army Reserve program received a lump sum.

I want to go forward, and I think you will be interested in this. The several States now have appropriated through

their State legislatures the sum of \$35 million. That money is now available from the States for matching for the building of armories for this reserve program. But since the money appropriated by the Congress has not been released, the matching money from the States has not been consumed, which is something like \$35 million that is available for the program at this time.

I want to add this: After going into this matter carefully, your committee felt that we should add some money for the National Guard program; therefore, we added \$6 million for the Army National Guard program. We felt money should be added for the Army Reserve program, and we added \$5 million for the Army Reserve program. That \$11 million is added in title VI of the bill. To be sure that armories would be built under this additional amount, we sent down to the Department and asked them to send up a priority list covering the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve program. That list came up and it was adopted by your subcommittee in a part of the committee report and in a part of the bill just as it was sent to us. There has not been a change. The priorities were sent by the Department itself. So that your bill comes to you with title VI, showing a total of \$39,958,000 as the total amount authorized in title VI, which is the Reserve program.

In conclusion I want to say this: The Reserve program has been moving forward satisfactorily. In spite of the fact that funds have been held back from time to time, the program has been developed in an orderly manner and it has been very successful. In certain instances your armories are used every night in the week and sometimes in the afternoon. The program generally is reaching a point where we can see that we are over the hill and that we are coming to the end of the Navy and the Marine program. We are over the hill in regard to the Air Force Reserve program. We still have to do considerably more work on the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard program. We are giving our thought and our mind and our activity in this direction with the hope that within the next few years we can come to you and tell you that we have a completed Reserve construction program.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. I would like to compliment the committee on this arduous work and careful study of this particular problem. I have just one question I would like to ask. I am referring specifically to page 29 of the committee report which refers to the purchase and disposition of real estate. I would like to ask this committee whether or not the committee has given any consideration to certain policies that should be used by the armed services, particularly the Air Force, in the purchase of land. I illustrate what I am trying to say. We find so many times that people who have land adjoining a military installation are forced to settle by condemnation

rather than by negotiation, and as a result it has been a loss to the people in that particular area.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to thank the gentleman very much for asking that particular question, and I want to say this, that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services set up a special subcommittee to check into the matter of the use of land by the military and especially the use of the power of eminent domain, which I think in many instances has been abused by the armed services. The subcommittee has held hearings. We have heard witnesses from the Justice Department making certain suggestions, and we have also heard witnesses from other departments, and we are working on the program that the gentleman has in mind looking toward the point where more definite rules for the acquisition of land by the military will be set up. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I think it is of very great importance, because we must have excellent public relations between the public, the people in the adjoining area, and the military, and I sometimes feel that the arbitrary attitude taken by the military, particularly in some instances, has created ill will toward the military installations in that area. I think that this is unfortunate. Secondly, it has been a great loss to the people in the area. I refer specifically to one instance in which I have been in contact with the Air Force real estate division for quite some time. They are trying to force a farmer to take much less for his land than the current value of the land in the surrounding area. I still think it is very unjust, and I hope the matter can be corrected.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman has some excellent ideas there. I want to say this, too, in addition to what I said about hearings of our subcommittee on that particular matter, that I think there really has been abuse, and the Congress can do a great deal to assist in this sort of program. But, in addition to this, the Committee on Public Works has a bill pending before it which it is considering at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 13015, comes before the House, as is already abundantly clear, after long, exhaustive, and thorough hearings. The bill is highly technical, and it would seem to me that it is not a bill that can be amended or greatly changed on the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has, I think, one inherent handicap, and that is that it has little glamor and almost no drama connected with it. At first blush, one cannot become highly excited about an automotive repair shop or the installation of a new heating plant in the administrative building at a distant Army post.

Much of the legislation which comes before this House has a strong, intimate

and personal impact on individual Members of the House and on their constituencies. People—individuals—are immediately and importantly affected by much of it.

Because this bill does lack color, it does not arouse strong partisan feelings on any overall basis. And, because of this, stimulating and thought-provoking debate is somewhat of a rarity during its consideration.

I think this is wrong. No bill that comes on the floor of this House is, to my mind, more important than the construction bill for the military departments.

As our distinguished chairman has mentioned, there are three essential elements to defense: the men who are ready to fight; the equipment with which they would fight; and the bases which give them the foothold for the battle. If we eliminate any one of these elements, we have nothing. The man is the brain, the weapon is the instrument, and the base is the ground on which he stands.

This bill is the ground on which he stands.

Chairman VINSON has given in most admirable and comprehensive fashion all of the statistics of the bill—its size, its composition, and the highlights of the program both generally and with respect to the individual service. It was presented so clearly and so concisely that I shall not attempt to repeat what you already know.

I would rather speak briefly on some general matters relating to the bill.

For example, I was most impressed by the great wealth of information which was already in the minds of the committee members at the time we started hearings on the bill and before any consideration of the detailed items that comprise it.

This is understandable since, while there have been some new installations established within the last few years, the great bulk of our base structure for the military departments is made up of installations which have been in existence since the beginning of World War II—and in many instances installations which go back many, many years before that.

Many of the members of the Armed Services Committee and, of course, particularly the chairman and those members seated close to him on both sides, have been dealing with legislation of this kind over a great many years, and, therefore, can draw upon an abundance of knowledge not only of the general defense picture but also in truly remarkable detail with respect to specific installations.

An example of this—and, indeed, it is an example of a number of elements to which I wish to refer—is the naval shipyard at Long Beach, Calif. The authority granted for this shipyard in the bill this year is actually not new at all. This shipyard has been under study for a number of years in view of the fact that it has been subsidizing each year over quite a period of time.

Last year because of the concern which the committee felt with respect

to this subsidence a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee visited the shipyard, made a detailed inspection, and made a report to the full committee. A development with respect to this particular item is the fact that the State of California passed very recently legislation which will insure the repressurization of the area in which the shipyard is in order to prevent further subsidence.

Perhaps one should not give full credit to the Armed Services Committee for the passage of this legislation by the State of California, but very great credit is due the committee because of its insistence that aggressive and effective action be taken by the State. Therefore, it is more than merely coincidental that the State passed this legislation.

So, it is clear from an example of this kind that not a great deal of wholly new material is presented to the committee each year but rather, a series of steps in a continuous process of protecting, improving, and making more efficient our base structure.

With the new weapons and the new supporting facilities for them which, of course, in this time of rapid change are constantly coming into the program, the committee draws upon its great background of information to survey these items, too, with a critical eye.

I would like to cite an example of this. In the program this year there are several sites for the Bomarc missile. The cost set out for the supporting facilities were in the order of \$13½ million per site. After a close examination of these several sites by the committee, it was revealed that very recent contract experience indicated that the cost of one of these sites could be cut by as much as three to three and one-half million dollars. I would not wish to create the impression that the costs furnished by the Department were deliberately high in the first instance. It was, rather, that since the facilities were of a new type, the design and plans could not be as particularized as one might wish. They did not constitute, in other words, as is true of many construction items in the program, repetitive structures with common design and common plans and specifications.

However, again the committee drawing on its experience was able to make a rather substantial cut in this particular part of the program without in any way affecting the defense aspect of the Bomarc missile facilities.

Another area in which it is gratifying that the committee did not make a cut was that portion of the bill which deals with the new Advanced Research Projects Agency. The authority granted by title IV of the bill for this organization is the first of its kind in a military construction program.

Without intending to be facetious, the letters "ARPA," which is the short name for this Agency, could well be thought of as "always remember projects ahead." Here we have an organization whose charter, so to speak, is to deal in fields where there may be little, if any, practical application in the immediate future. It is, however, from research of this kind

that come our truly great advances in scientific fields.

Practicality is a virtue. An unreasonable practicality which could be called also shortsightedness is the opposite. We cannot think of today and the immediate tomorrow only. We must project ourselves—as other parts of the world are doing, notably the U. S. S. R.—to make sure that we have the basic knowledge that will permit far-reaching extensions of our weapon systems as time goes on. We cannot afford to be narrow. We cannot afford to be unimaginative. Indeed, we must be far seeing and bold in our perspective of the future.

Mr. Roy W. Johnson, the Director of ARPA, when he appeared before the committee, stated that his agency was organized "to provide for the Department of Defense forward-looking research programs which in the past have been retarded by the necessity for a formal military requirement." He went on to say that the organization of the agency "is in recognition of the importance of pushing advanced research which may have military application even before we know whether the results will be fruitful and how any results achieved may be used."

This position is, of course, wholly consistent with the ideas which I have tried to express, and indicate a refreshing and encouraging kind of imaginative outlook.

The agency will do little construction as such, but plans to use existing facilities of the military departments and organizations such as the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the National Academy of Sciences, the National Scientific Foundation, and our great universities throughout the country. This, to my mind, is a true step forward and I know every Member of this House would join with me in providing every encouragement for this program.

One concluding word concerning the bill. I would like to draw the attention of all Members of the House to the report on this bill. It is a long one—81 pages—but is broken down in such fashion as to make it relatively simple to study any particular parts of the program which are of special interest to the individual.

Each of the military programs is broken down not only by types of facilities but by commands and by other functional divisions. The general provisions are explained in what is a completely clear fashion and at the very end of the report is the State breakdown listing by geographical area within and without the United States all of the installations which appear in the program, with the exception, of course, of certain classified facilities.

May I urge, then, on all of the Members of the House a study of this report and the favorable vote on the bill which I believe is clearly warranted.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my distinguished colleague and fellow member of the committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I wish to congratulate you for the very splendid remarks you have just made and to say that these remarks are in keeping with the fine work you have been doing as a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank my colleague.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to pay tribute to the gentlewoman from New York for the very fine work she has done with reference to the reserve program. The consideration she has given to the work on the subcommittee has been refreshing to all the members of the committee.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank my chairman of the subcommittee. May I say it has been an inspiration and a pleasure to work with him.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I would like to state to the House that the total devotion which the gentlewoman from New York has shown in the preparation of this bill and her constant attention at the hearings indicates her knowledge of the subject and her firm desire to be a good member of a good committee and to render a great service to the Nation, which is all reflected in the very fine statement that she has just made.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I rise with a great deal of reluctance because it is not easy to oppose or question a project that is reported to the House by such an illustrious committee as the Committee on Armed Services. I am further reluctant to say anything because one would sometimes look at the mentality of a Member of Congress who got up and questioned the advisability of spending several million dollars for a project within his home State. Further to add to my reluctance is the fact that this project is named after a personal friend of mine, a Maj. Richard Bong, a young farm boy who left the farm and in 2 years learned to fly a plane and shot down 40 Japanese aircraft. But, authorities in Wisconsin who are interested in air safety seriously question the advisability of building an air base for the Defense Command and the Strategic Air Command at Kansasville, Wis. It has been stated that the Civil Aeronautics Authority, after investigating, finally gave clearance to the project. But, I think that is only part of the story. It should be brought out that the CAA authorities gave clearance to the project only after the Air Force agreed that that base after it was established and built and used, that the air defense planes and the strategic

air defense planes would fly only in certain directions.

I wonder about the advisability of spending \$100 million even for an air base for the Air Defense Command, the Strategic Air Command which by civil protection is going to be used by planes that are going to be able to take off and come back only in certain directions.

I am not going to ask this committee or the Congress to do anything about the authorization for further money for this airport, but I am going to ask the Committee on Appropriations to take a further look at it to see if this project actually ought to be built.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, war is a terrible thing. War is the most expensive pastime we have ever had in the world. You pay for wars indefinitely. I recall when I first came to this noble body the debt limit was under \$40 billion; the debt was under \$40 billion. Today it is approximately \$280 billion. Why? Because of war.

We have had 3 terrible wars, 4 in my lifetime, even including the Spanish-American War; and none of them are completely paid for and probably will not be in a century or two. Regardless of whether we should have had those wars or not, we had them; it is water over the dam.

Now we are faced with another situation: Whether we will have another war we do not know; we hope and pray we will not, but we must not take any chances with the security of our country.

Your Committee on the Armed Services in the hearings on the authorization bill now before you took all of these matters into consideration, went over this bill line by line and item by item, and I approved most of it. Maybe I did not agree with all parts of it, but the overall is very good, very conservative, very sound, and very reasonable when you realize that we are dealing with the security of our country. If we should have another of those terrible wars, regardless of the expense involved and the cost in human life, we must not be reasonably unprepared. On the contrary, we must be reasonably prepared.

In my opinion, this bill is a minimum in preparedness and authorizations for preparedness that we may dare risk today if we are interested in our country.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon mention was made of what I call the Truman Airport at Grandview, Mo. I understood the chairman to say that it now is known as the Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base.

On page 35 there is an appropriation for the Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base at Kansas City, Mo.

On page 76 it is the Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base at Belton, Mo.

On page 58 there is an appropriation for the Grandview Air Force Base, at Kansas City, Mo.

I am puzzled by all this; is this the Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, the Truman Airport, or the Grandview Air Force Base?

Mr. VINSON. I would say to the gentleman that it is all the same base.

Mr. GROSS. All the same?

Mr. VINSON. All the same.

Mr. GROSS. With some \$3 million total appropriated for that installation?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct. It is written out in the bill here.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask a question that I have asked every year, and that is whether the Continental Air Command has been moved down there, as I was assured it would be when the authorization first went through several years ago?

Mr. VINSON. It has not been moved from Mitchel Airfield, N. Y.

Mr. GROSS. It is still there?

Mr. VINSON. It is still there.

Mr. GROSS. So it never became the headquarters of the Continental Air Command?

Mr. VINSON. No. I understand the reason the gentleman is making the inquiry, but that did not take place.

Mr. GROSS. I did not think it would be moved from New York.

Mr. VINSON. The Mitchel Airbase is still there.

Mr. GROSS. And members of the Truman family have sold the last 220 acres of land they owned around the Grand View Airbase?

Mr. VINSON. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. GROSS. Well, if memory serves me correctly, the family had some 600 acres there, but, I understand, a few weeks ago they sold the last 220 acres, I imagine at a pretty good price after the airbase was put in there.

Mr. Chairman, if my figures are correct, there are around 5,000 housing units in this bill to be constructed overseas; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. That is probably correct. There are 6,673 houses that will be built overseas under what is known as the surplus agricultural commodity program.

Mr. GROSS. Those will be built out of counterpart funds; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. Oh, no. They are built out of what is known as the surplus agricultural commodity program. That is a program that has been worked up by the Agricultural Commodities Commission.

Mr. GROSS. What kind of currency do they use? What funds are used?

Mr. VINSON. They use local funds.

Mr. GROSS. Local currency?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Are they not counterpart funds?

Mr. VINSON. No, it is not counterpart funds. It has no relation to counterpart funds. This money is derived out of the surplus agricultural commodity program. That is, when we ship commodities abroad for this purpose,

cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco—whatever it is—it is sold entirely by the surplus agricultural program.

Mr. GROSS. No dollars go into this at all; no dollars except as the surplus agricultural commodities are purchased in this country? No dollars go into this construction overseas, is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I say to the gentleman, where equipment or material cannot be locally purchased, they may have in those instances to spend dollars to bring them into the country; but, generally speaking, the agricultural commodities are sold over in those countries, then the money that is raised by the sale of those commodities is placed in the building of the housing in question for our troops.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: What happens if these housing facilities are abandoned or are found to be unnecessary, whatever word you want to use? What happens to them?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is a matter subject to negotiation. We anticipate using them for some time.

Mr. GROSS. Are they sold to the local governments? What is done with them?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They are placed for future disposition.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. What is the source of counterpart funds if it is not from the sale of surplus products?

Mr. GROSS. That is one of the sources.

Mr. MASON. It is the main source.

Mr. VINSON. Counterpart money comes out of the mutual security program and has no relation to this phase at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I also made inquiry relative to this program of surplus commodities. Under this program, foreign currencies are generated through country-to-country agreements covering the sale of surplus agricultural commodities. A portion of the funds generated are set aside for the payment of construction costs of United States military family housing. In some cases, such as the United Kingdom and Japan, the local currency has been adequate to meet all costs. In others, however, such as Spain and Morocco, the local currency has been supplemented by appropriated dollars—up to a limit of 25 percent of the total cost—in order to obtain scarce items not available locally.

The occupants of this housing forfeit their quarters allowances which are used, first, to pay maintenance and operating costs and, second, to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the foreign currencies used.

One important advantage of the surplus commodity program is that the quarters allowances are used to repay the Commodity Credit Corporation, so that there is no outflow of gold from the United States.

I trust that explains the matter the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, but what I would like to know is, when is this sort of program ever going to end? Is it going on indefinitely and forever? Are we going to continue each year the building of thousands of housing units overseas?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I hope the time will come soon when all of our houses in Europe and every place else will be vacant.

Mr. GROSS. I hope so, too, but every year you come in with a bill for more thousands. Now, I would like to ask one other question. This bill provides for the leasing of housing overseas. Under what conditions is this to be undertaken?

Mr. VINSON. I will say it does not apply to the leasing of any housing overseas. In response to the question, "When will there cease to be any further building," it is hoped that the program will be completed next year or probably the following year. Within 2 years, at least, there should be no more programs of this kind. We hope within the next year it may end.

Mr. GROSS. On page 8 of the bill, section 104 (a), it reads:

In accordance with the provisions of section 407—

And so on and so forth—

as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations—

Then those are all foreign locations.

Mr. VINSON. Notwithstanding that language, my statement is correct. That is nothing but standard language which appears in the bill in dealing with this broad subject. But there are no plans to lease any quarters.

Mr. GROSS. But you do provide a clear provision for leasing housing facilities overseas.

Mr. VINSON. I understand that. It is just one of those things that happens to be written in like other language that is written, but that is all.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, there is nothing to prevent them from leasing housing overseas if they want to do it under the terms of this bill?

Mr. VINSON. Suppose we do lease them. What will be wrong with that? There is no plan to lease them, so far as the information before the committee was concerned, but there is nothing wrong with leasing them if it is necessary to house American dependents on foreign shores.

Mr. GROSS. Had you said the military is leasing housing overseas, my next question would have been under what terms and conditions, because I am informed that some agencies of Govern-

ment are paying fabulous prices for leased property.

Mr. VINSON. Well, there is a standard as to how much a man can get for rental allowance, and a lease is always based on the rental allowance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been thoroughly debated and I think fully explained. It was my privilege to work along with my colleagues and our distinguished chairman in its preparation. Like the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] said, we must survive. There is no cut-rate way to survive or furnish armaments to survive in this nuclear, in this space, in this missile age. This is the best we can give you from the best we have. We urge you to accept our recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said, I have participated in the thorough examination which the House Armed Services Committee has made covering this bill and I wish to assure the Congress that it was most thoroughly reviewed. Certain projects which we considered to be merely desirable, but not essential, were eliminated by our committee and the remaining work which this bill authorizes is strictly limited to projects for which a compelling military necessity exists.

Throughout our study of this bill our committee kept firmly in mind the fact that heavy expenditures for new modern types of weapons will create tremendous financial burdens for the next several years. For this reason each project in this bill was carefully scrutinized and I feel that the work covered by this bill is the minimum amount needed to satisfactorily support the missions which are assigned to our military forces.

To illustrate the importance of the work which is to be authorized by this bill, I would like to point out that 32 percent of the projects which it authorizes are directly in support of our missile programs and their associated nuclear capability. Approximately 14 percent is required for radar defense systems. Approximately 12 percent is for improving the capability of the Strategic Air Command. Substantial amounts are also provided for research and development, submarine and antisubmarine activities, fighter aircraft programs, combat training, and other essential activities of the three military departments. I wish I could state publicly what I know about the mission of MATS. This is impossible for security reasons. I would, however, like to speak on this subject to the extent that I can.

Mr. Chairman, I think it timely and important that I make a few remarks on the Military Air Transport Service.

It is true that the bill does not contain any large authorizations for this great organization but it has been the subject of scrutiny—and I might say, attack—during this Congress and I feel that the other side of the coin could well be studied by the Members of this House.

One of the defense functions receiving extended consideration by the House Armed Services Committee during the 1958 review of the military forces was that of military air transportation activities. This was deemed advisable in light of the interest of other committees, extending over several years, in the size, structure, and operations of MATS. Their findings and recommendations, following hearings on MATS, raised the question in the minds of the Armed Services Committee members as to whether they had entirely fulfilled the responsibilities of the committee. As a result a thorough searching inquiry was made into the premises. Questions were so framed by the members of the Armed Services Committee as to disclose all matters pertinent to MATS as a military force and its relationship to the armed services. Due to the disparaging, even though dispassionate views on MATS which exist, I feel that a more extensive discussion of the subject is required.

During the course of the hearings, testimony was given in opposition to MATS on the premise that it competes with civil air carriers. It has been further stated that this competition retards development of air transportation, and in several cases has been the cause for carriers going out of business. This complaint has been injected into congressional hearings for a number of years, and made the subject of public addresses, news items, magazine articles, and releases by business associations.

The gravity of these charges and the extent to which they have been exploited places an obligation upon the Armed Services Committee to inform the Congress and the general public in this matter.

The military threat which imperils free nations throughout the world is a direct threat to the peace and security of our own freedom. This has necessitated a broad peacetime military program to assure our defense against military aggression. Activation of this program in establishing, maintaining, and supporting essential preparedness forces for defense has generated military air traffic which is not too dissimilar to wartime requirements.

Utilization of the airlift capability and the maintenance and support man-hours, made available by the essential peacetime operations of MATS, to airlift the military traffic is commendable. It shows a sense of responsible management with deep concern for the taxpayer and far-reaching consideration of the national budget.

In reviewing the testimony adduced at the hearing, the committee finds that the military services have made significant contribution to the development of the civil air transportation industry. Millions of dollars annually have been paid to civil carriers for airlifting military traffic which exceeds the capability generated by MATS. However, it appears that continuous efforts are made by the civil carriers to obtain more military business by reducing the beneficial payload carried by MATS. The DOD would be amiss in wasting public monies

to procure such airlift merely to provide business to commercial operators. This would constitute a subsidy with funds appropriated for military defense purposes, which never has been intended by Congress. This view is strongly supported by the important fact that Congress specifically provided, in the Civil Aeronautics Act, the means by which the Government should ensure the economic development of civil air transportation system required by the public convenience and necessity.

In summary, the Committee on Armed Services does not concur with the views expressing competition by MATS. Instead the committee supports the policy and practice of the military in obtaining the most beneficial use of the airlift generated by MATS' peace-time operations and meeting essential requirements. The procurement of civil airlift to meet requirements which exceed MATS' capability should be continued; however, this supplemental lift should not constitute the mainstay of any civil carrier, nor should the revenues therefrom represent more than an element of byproduct income for such carriers.

The military has no authority, nor can it be expected to subsidize any carrier or class of carriers by the procurement of airlift or other services merely to keep an air carrier solvent. This is the duty and responsibility assigned by Congress to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The distinction between MATS and an airline is evident. An airline operates its services between communities on a schedule designed to afford the best frequencies of travel as dictated by the trade and commerce needs of the points serviced. MATS operates its transports to provide airlift as levied on it by the JCS and the several military services, in moving military traffic. The fact that some of these requirements can be airlifted more economically by operating military flights with limited regularity does not change the character of MATS from a military logistic operation to an airline operation.

Taking all of the foregoing into account, the Committee on Armed Services cannot agree with the common parlance which characterizes MATS as an airline. Conversely, it is the strongly held view of the Armed Services Committee that MATS is a carefully integrated part of the overall military force; further, the committee is fully convinced that MATS is designed, both as to size, composition, and character, to fulfill critical emergency military requirements which, by their nature, timing and need for security, can be met by no other means.

The security of the United States from enemy aggression can only be assured by a combat readiness to fend off all would-be assailants. The character of the potential enemy, the modern weapons for making warfare, and the geographical locations of friendly nations compel the maintenance of a unified defense, alert and ready. For the United States this has mandated a broad program worldwide, and necessitates a continued deployment of military personnel, armaments, and support to almost every corner of the earth not controlled by the

U. S. S. R. The MATS' transport mission is essential to the success of the initial actions. The emergency transport mission to be successful will commence before or concurrently with strategic deployments if such become necessary. While attrition is to be expected in any case, the losses could be significantly more extensive if MATS' mission failed. For this reason the MATS' transport fleet is operated to provide the continuous exercise of its facilities and to produce manpower training and operational readiness under military command and control. The importance of MATS' strategic-transport operations requires the same kinds of training and readiness as are required of all military components which will be engaged in combat duty.

In conclusion—and regardless of the fact that I have said or intimated this fact throughout my remarks—I want to say again that the Military Air Transport Service is not an airline. It is an essential, integral part of our fighting forces.

I urge the complete support of every Member of this House for the military construction bill this year.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am certainly not rising in a spirit of criticism of a great committee, but I am seeking a little information. I have a special interest in the Fifth Army not only because the Fifth Army services 13 of the Middle Western States, almost twice as many States as are served by any of our other armies, but also because of a personal interest, because my Chicago congressional offices are with the Fifth Army Headquarters.

I note in the report that the First Army, which covers 8 Eastern States, gets 1.2 percent of the program; the Second Army, which serves 7 states, including Pennsylvania and Ohio, gets 1 percent; that the Third Army, which services 7 Southern States, including the great State of Georgia and the great State of South Carolina and other great States in that region, gets 3.3 percent; the Fourth Army, which serves 5 States, including the great State of Texas, gets 6.4 percent; the Fifth Army, servicing 13 States, 13 big States in the Middle West and West, gets 0.9 percent—less than 1 percent. The Sixth Army, serving 8 Western States, gets 2.7 percent. At the bottom of the list is the Fifth Army, servicing 13 great Middle Western States, including Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota. I wonder why it is that the Fifth Army always comes out at the bottom of the list.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. VINSON. I think that is a very high compliment to the Fifth Army area. It shows that in this great section of the Republic, in the States of Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North

Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming, that climatic and other conditions are such and the management by the commanding officers is of such a high efficiency that there is no need for as much repair of installations, and there is no military necessity for building any new installations. This bill is not written on geographical considerations. It is written on military needs and requirements. So I say it is a compliment to that great section that it is not calling upon the Treasury of the United States for money to maintain its magnificent installations, because they do not need to be cared for by direct appropriation this year.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. From the bottom of my heart I thank the distinguished chairman. He replied exactly as I thought he would and has made it possible for me, when I return to the headquarters of the Fifth Army, to tell them that I am bringing from the great chairman of this great committee the word that the Fifth Army is tops.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly, it is tops.

SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, in St. Clair County, Ill., some 34 years ago, one of the major installations of today's Air Force, Scott Air Force Base, had its beginning as an integral part of the Army's first air arm. Records indicate that the site for a mammoth aviation school was chosen by Congress on June 14, 1917, and construction began several weeks later.

Following the usual procedure of naming aviation fields in honor of American flyers who had distinguished themselves, the new school was named for Corp. Frank S. Scott. Scott had lost his life several years earlier on an experimental flight at College Park, Md. He is believed to have been the first enlisted man to die as the result of an air accident.

Although Scott Field, as it was originally called, was a vital factor in the winning of World War I, it was not until June 25, 1919, that the Government actually purchased the property at a cost of \$119,285. It occupies 2,761 acres of land in St. Clair County.

During the twenties and early thirties, Scott became the Army's center of lighter-than-air flying. In 1921 construction began on an airship hangar which was to be the second largest structure of its kind in the world. For 18 years it was a middle-western landmark, the symbol of a great base, guided for many years by Col. John A. Paegelow, one of the world's authorities on lighter-than-air craft.

The year 1939 spelled the end of the lighter-than-air era. The dirigible hangar was razed and replaced by a more modern airplane hangar. The acreage was increased considerably when two new areas housing the parent radio school of the Air Corps were incorporated. During the period 1939 to 1947 this base expanded its technical training facilities and functions, for the primary purpose of furnishing skilled operating personnel for military service, and played an im-

portant part in the successful conclusion of World War II.

In 1947 the Technical Division of the Air Training Command moved its headquarters to Scott Air Force Base from St. Louis and in 1949 the Air Training Command, consolidating its divisions, established new headquarters here. In 1951 the command again decentralized its activities into air forces, one specializing in technical and the other in flying training. In early 1952 a crew-training air force was organized.

In order to consolidate flying training and technical training activities into a single-unit organization, resulting from development of more complex aircraft, the headquarters of Air Training Command in the fall of 1957 moved to Randolph Air Force Base, Tex. Concurrently, the headquarters of Military Air Transport Service Headquarters was transferred to Scott Air Force Base from Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Prince Georges County, Md.

This move was made in order to effectuate a more efficient and centralized location for the worldwide operations of the Military Air Transport Service. The release of facilities at Andrews Air Force Base permitted the transfer of headquarters Air Research and Development Command, formerly located in scattered and rented buildings in the city of Baltimore, Md., to establish their consolidated headquarters in permanent buildings at this location at minimum cost and disruption of activities. This location is also advantageous to the Government in that it permits constant liaison to be maintained with all branches of the military services in the Washington area.

The joint users of Scott Air Force Base include Air Defense Command, Air Training Command, Continental Air Command, and the headquarters of Military Air Transport Service.

The transfer and establishment of the organizational functions of MATS headquarters at this location was quickly and economically effected with minimum disruption to operational command activities.

Existing facilities to accommodate this movement were found to be satisfactory and minimum expenditures of funds in future years are anticipated. Approximately 3,000 military personnel are permanently assigned here with 2,500 additional civilians employed for a total strength of 5,500 persons.

The mission of the Military Air Transport Service is to provide, first, airlift required in support of approved joint war plans; second, scheduled airlift for the Department of Defense within the continental United States between the continental United States and overseas areas, and between and within overseas areas as directed by higher authority; third, worldwide air transport, air weather, airways and air communications, and air rescue service systems; fourth, flight service within the zone of interior; fifth, organization and training of air resupply and communications services; sixth, supervision and control and maintenance of primary facilities for performing its assigned mission; and seventh, theater jurisdiction in overseas

areas where MATS units are stationed but which are outside the jurisdiction of any theater commander.

Belleville, Ill., 6 miles west of Scott Air Force Base, is the seat of government of St. Clair County. It was settled in 1806, established in 1814, and incorporated in 1819.

The center of a vast farming area, it is also the stove manufacturing capital of the United States. In addition, there are unlimited supplies of bituminous coal and high-grade limestone.

The population of Belleville is estimated around 40,000, occupying an area of 6.5 square miles. The mean annual temperature is 56.3 with an average annual rainfall of 37.2 inches. The humidity maintains an annual average of 0.70 and the prevailing winds are south. The city is 420 to 630 feet above sea level.

The city has a first-class hotel, numerous tourist homes, and tourist courts. It has a modern hospital, two homes for aged, a good nursing home, and an orphanage maintained by the Catholic diocese of Belleville.

There are 4 large theaters and 1 drive-in, a 26-acre municipal park, and 3 golf courses.

Churches of every major faith welcome Scott personnel and many maintain service centers.

There are 2 daily newspapers and 1 radio station.

East St. Louis which joins Belleville on the west, has an estimated population of nearly 100,000. It boasts several good motels and a modern hotel, parks, and golf courses. It is one of the largest livestock centers in the world.

There are two major hospitals in East St. Louis, with a tuberculosis sanitarium close by. It is the home of Parks College of St. Louis University, one of the few institutions in the United States offering a college degree in various phases of aeronautics.

St. Louis, Mo., hub of most of the activities of this area, is a center of a population of close to 2 million. The second largest railroad center in the United States, it is also served by all major airlines.

It is the shoe and beer manufacturing center of the United States and the home of the famous Washington University Medical Center and St. Louis University Medical School. It is the world's largest raw fur market, the center of a large chemical industry, and along with its sister city, the center of a meatpacking industry rivaled only by Chicago.

Back in Illinois, several small communities lie within a 10-mile radius of Scott Air Force Base. Many officers, airmen, and civilian personnel of Scott reside in Lebanon, O'Fallon, and Mascoutah, as well as in other outlying communities. Lebanon is the home of McKendree College, over 100 years old, and boasts a country club with swimming pool and golf course. Many Scott personnel are active members of this club.

The Air Force has invested \$58 million in this installation to date, with an additional expenditure of \$693,000 planned

for construction under authorization being provided by this fiscal year 1959 construction authorization bill.

Additional investments in future years are planned by the Air Force to expand and improve the facilities at this important Air Force Base.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, this bill now before the House which would authorize 1959 fiscal year military and naval construction contains two items which I have been supporting for some time. The first is an authorization for the construction of 310 Capehart housing units at Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Mass., at a cost of \$1,345,000 and the second authorizes the construction of a National Guard Armory at Agawam, Mass., at a cost of \$170,000.

Mr. Chairman, Westover Air Force Base is the headquarters of the Strategic Air Command's Eighth Air Force. Since the Atlantic Division of the Military Air Transport Service vacated Westover Field in 1955 and the Strategic Air Command took over command of the facility, there has been a tremendous increase in the number of military personnel assigned to the base. Naturally, military families have found difficulty in obtaining housing in off-base communities close enough so that there would be no great travel time lag in the event of an emergency. The military commanders at the base were concerned over key personnel such as pilots and engineers living at great distances from their aircraft. As we all know, the Strategic Air Command is still our first line of defense and SAC planes and crews are on a 24-hour a day alert. The late Brig. Gen. Donald W. Saunders, who commanded the 57th Air Division at Westover until he was killed in the tragic take-off crash of a jet tanker on June 27, had expressed his concern to me about the need of more on-base housing for his military personnel. I am quite pleased to know that this legislation contains an authorization item for 310 housing units at Westover. Construction of these units will start in the fall. The Strategic Air Command has already asked for 370 additional Capehart units for Westover, and this request has been approved by Air Force Headquarters. It is my understanding that the Defense Department has deferred action on the 370 additional units until such time as construction is well underway on the 310 units contained in this bill. Authorization for the 370 additional units will have to come through in subsequent authorization legislation.

Because of General Saunders' keen interest in these 310 housing units for his officers and men at Westover, I think it was most fitting and proper that Westover Air Force Base officials have decided to name the new housing project Saunders Knoll out of respect for the memory of the late General Saunders.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following news story from the Springfield Daily News on July 3, announcing the naming of the housing project as Saunders Knoll:

SAUNDERS KNOLL TO BE NAME OF NEW HOUSING ON BASE—FIRST SECTION OF PROJECT TO BE MEMORIAL TO COMMANDER OF 57TH AIR DIVISION KILLED IN CRASH

WESTOVER AIR FORCE BASE, July 3.—Brig. Gen. Donald W. Saunders, commander of the 57th Air Division, who was killed last Friday in the crash of the KC-135 Stratotanker here, will be memorialized when the first portion of the new Capehart housing project is constructed on this Strategic Air Command base.

Base officials today announced that the initial part of the 310-unit housing project will be named Saunders Knoll in honor of the 57th Air Division commander.

One of the other portions of the huge housing project will be named in honor of 1 of the 2 sergeants who were killed aboard the same plane.

General Saunders was the aircraft commander of the number three craft "Cocoa" in the ill-fated flight. All 15 occupants of the plane, including the crew of 7, 6 newsmen and 2 aeronautical officials lost their lives when the plane failed to gain altitude and hit high tension lines and then crashed into a cornfield nearly a mile from the end of the Westover runway.

General Saunders, 45, had been commander of the 57th Air Division at Westover since September 24, 1956.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House authorizes an expenditure of \$135,000 for an Army National Guard Armory in Caldwell, Ohio. Caldwell is the county seat of Noble County in the 15th district of Ohio, which I have the honor to represent.

I should like to call the importance of this measure to the attention of the Members of the House for indeed it is an important item.

For many years Caldwell had no National Guard unit. From time to time interest was displayed only to subside because of the seeming impossibility of obtaining training facilities. Recently local interest has been increasing and a National Guard unit was formed which has trained and performed admirably. Its presence has been a source of pride to the community and is providing our State and our Nation with an important arm of defense. We will make no mistake in providing this authorization. We would make grave errors if we should fail to authorize it. The Adjutant General of Ohio has approved this installation, and the matching funds are available. The National Guard Bureau has also approved the facility and requested it be given priority.

The National Guard program will be further strengthened by this installation in Caldwell, Ohio. I urge its approval.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I have not asked for any time and I desire no time.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing per-

manent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Technical Services Facilities

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,697,000.

Detroit Arsenal, Mich.: Administrative facilities, \$5,666,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Ala.: Administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$8,529,000.

Rock Island Arsenal, Ill.: Operational and training facilities, \$570,000.

White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, research, development and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$7,931,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Fort Lee, Va.: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$4,630,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Army Chemical Center, Md.: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

Fort Detrick, Md.: Troop housing, \$1,795,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Ariz.: Maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$9,098,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Army May Service, Md.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,913,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Va.: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,634,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colo.: Troop housing, \$862,000.

Field Forces Facilities

(First Army area)

Fort Devens, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, \$171,000.

Fort Dix, N. J.: Troop housing and utilities, \$3,749,000.

(Second Army area)

Carlisle Barracks, Pa.: Hospital facilities, family housing, and real estate, \$2,274,000.

Fort Knox, Ky.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$516,000.

Fort Meade, Md.: Operational and training facilities, \$498,000.

Fort Ritchie, Md.: Supply facilities, \$43,000.

(Third Army area)

Fort Benning, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and family housing, \$3,454,000.

Fort Bragg, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$762,000.

Fort Campbell, Ky.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and administrative facilities, \$847,000.

Fort McClellan, Ala.: Operational and training.

Fort Rucker, Ala.: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,406,000.

(Fourth Army area)

Fort Bliss, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$13,734,000.

Fort Hood, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,258,000.

Fort Sill, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$3,227,000.

(Fifth Army area)

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.: Troop housing, and family housing, \$783,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,076,000.

Fort Riley, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,084,000.

(Sixth Army area)

Baywood Park, Calif.: Real estate, \$144,000.

Camp Desert Rock, Nev.: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,892,000.

Fort Lewis, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,085,000.

Fort Ord, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,733,000.

Yuma Test Station, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, \$173,000.

(Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.: Troop housing, medical facilities, and community facilities, \$5,844,000.

(Armed Forces special weapons)

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$273,000.

(Tactical installations support facilities)

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, \$6,311,000.

Outside continental United States

(Alaskan area)

Fairbanks Permafrost Research area: Real estate, \$7,000.

(Pacific Command area)

Kawaihae Harbor, T. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$240,000.

Schofield Barracks, T. H.: Troop housing, \$593,000.

Fort Shafter, T. H.: Supply facilities, maintenance facilities, family housing, and community facilities, \$2,925,000.

Korea: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$904,000.

(United States Army, Europe)

France: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,063,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$201,121,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons development, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$10 million: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services, of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of

construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 298 units.

Vicenza, Italy, 371 units.

Army Security Agency, location 13, 91 units.

Gateway Communications Station, 174 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Inside the United States

Redstone Arsenal, Ala., 316 units.

Seneca Ordnance Depot, N. Y., 120 units.

White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex., 200 units.

Fort Monmouth, N. J., 130 units.

Fort Lee, Va., 435 units.

Natick R&E, Mass., 35 units.

Fort Belvoir, Va., 618 units.

Two Rock Ranch Station, Calif., 25 units.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 50 units.

Beaumont Army Hospital, Tex., 125 units.

Fort Totten, N. Y., 130 units.

Fort Campbell, Ky., 837 units.

Granite City Engineer Depot, Ill., 65 units.

Fort Rucker, Ala., 400 units.

Fort Stewart, Ga., 73 units.

Fort Bliss, Tex., 410 units.

Fort Hood, Tex., 500 units.

Fort Sill, Okla., 349 units.

Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., 700 units.

Fort Leavenworth, Kans., 200 units.

Fort Sheridan, Ill., 50 units.

Fort Baker and Barry, Calif., 98 units.

Oakland Army Terminal, Calif., 83 units.

Fort Lewis, Wash., 856 units.

Branch United States Disciplinary Bar-

racks, Calif., 160 units.

United States Military Academy, N. Y.,

156 units.

Bossier Base, La., 200 units.

Fort Eustis, Va., 223 units.

Medina Base, Tex., 125 units.

Sandia Base, N. Mex., 213 units.

Army Air Defense command stations, 466

units.

Outside the United States

Canal Zone, 330 units.

Schofield Barracks, T. H., 385 units.

Fort Shafter, T. H., 481 units: *Provided, however*, That no family housing units shall be constructed on Fort DeRussy.

(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to acquire family housing at the following location: Aberdeen Proving Ground, Aberdeen, Md., 796 units.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 209, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "Technical Service Facilities (Ordnance Corps)," with respect to Pueblo Ordnance Depot, Colo., strike out "\$563,000" and insert in place thereof "\$600,000."

(b) Public Law 209, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$44,-

407,000" and "\$134,075,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$44,444,000" and "\$134,112,000," respectively.

SEC. 106 (a) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Transportation Corps)," with respect to Point-Aux-Pins Ammunition Terminal, Alabama-Mississippi, strike out "Point-Aux-Pins Area Ammunition Terminal, Alabama-Mississippi: Ammunition loading terminal, including acquisition of land, \$26,951,000" and insert in place thereof "Point-Aux-Pins Area Ammunition Storage Depot and Terminal, Alabama-Mississippi: Ammunition storage depot and ammunition loading terminal, including acquisition of land, \$44,168,000."

(b) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$131,906,000" and "\$238,870,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$149,123,000" and "\$256,087,000," respectively.

SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Ordnance Corps)," with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Ala., strike out "\$2,865,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,180,000."

(2) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Monmouth, N. J., strike out "\$615,000" and insert in place thereof "\$731,000"; and with respect to Vint Hill Farms Station, Va., strike out "\$695,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,022,000."

(3) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Corps of Engineers)," with respect to Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois, strike out "\$1,822,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,815,000."

(4) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Medical Corps)," with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical Center, D. C., strike out "\$4,472,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,714,000."

(5) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Second Army Area)," with respect to Fort George G. Meade, Md., strike out "\$923,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,264,000."

(6) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Fourth Army Area)," with respect to Fort Bliss, Tex., strike out "\$4,645,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,965,000"; and with respect to Fort Sill, Okla., strike out "\$3,053,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,454,000."

(7) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Sixth Army Area)," with respect to Fort Ord, Calif., strike out "\$1,407,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,742,000."

(8) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Military Academy)," with respect to the United States Military Academy, New York, strike out "\$756,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,171,000."

(b) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$237,320,000" and "\$546,387,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$244,125,000" and "\$553,192,000," respectively.

SEC. 108. (a) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Ordnance Corps)," with respect to White Sands Proving Ground, N. Mex., strike out "\$693,000" and insert in place thereof "\$735,000."

(2) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Chemical Corps)," with

respect to Camp Detrick, Md., strike out "\$913,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,074,000"; and with respect to Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, strike out "\$867,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,044,000."

(3) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)," with respect to Fort Huachuca, Ariz., strike out "\$6,856,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,576,000."

(4) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Corps of Engineers)," with respect to Fort Belvoir, Va., strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000."

(5) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Transportation Corps)," with respect to Fort Eustis, Va., strike out "\$1,231,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,436,000."

(6) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (First Army Area)," with respect to Fort Dix, N. J., strike out "\$54,000" and insert in place thereof "\$68,000."

(7) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Second Army Area)," with respect to Fort George G. Meade, Md., strike out "\$5,885,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,695,000."

(8) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Third Army Area)," with respect to Fort Benning, Ga., strike out "\$422,000" and insert in place thereof "\$616,000"; and with respect to Fort McClellan, Ala., strike out "\$397,000" and insert in place thereof "\$527,000."

(9) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Fourth Army Area)," with respect to Fort Hood, Tex., strike out "\$2,457,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,846,000."

(10) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Fifth Army Area)," with respect to Fort Riley, Kans., strike out "\$1,519,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,892,000."

(11) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Sixth Army Area)," with respect to Fort Lewis, Wash., strike out "\$3,022,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,596,000"; and with respect to Fort Ord, Calif., strike out "\$223,000" and insert in place thereof "\$319,000."

(b) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Outside the United States" in section 101, as follows:

Under the subheading "(Alaskan Area)," with respect to Wildwood Station (Kenai), strike out "\$352,000" and insert in place thereof "\$516,000."

(c) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 402 the amounts "\$95,010,000," "\$35,763,000," and "\$334,104,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$100,343,000," "\$35,927,000," and "\$339,601,000," respectively.

SEC. 109. (a) Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Corps of Engineers)," with respect to Cold Regions Laboratory, Hanover, N. H., strike out "\$2,496,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,787,000."

(b) Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$115,624,000" and "\$293,103,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$116,915,000" and "\$294,394,000."

SEC. 110. The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to enter into a contract or contracts for the sale of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Texas, and convey a clear title by quitclaim deed all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to said depot, to any legal person or group, except Government agencies or departments, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be in the

public interest. The Secretary of the Army is directed to act as follows:

(1) The depot shall be moved to, and integrated with, the ammunition outloading terminal previously authorized for construction at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala., and, notwithstanding any other provisions of this or any other act, the authority contained in the act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 536), for the acquisition of land and initiation of construction for the Point-Aux-Pins facility shall continue in effect until specifically superseded, modified, or repealed.

(2) The sale of the San Jacinto Depot property shall be offered by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on behalf of and under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army within 18 months from the date of this act. No part of the land herein shall be sold, transferred, or occupied, by virtue of this transaction, by any Government agency or department.

(3) A contract or contracts for the sale of the San Jacinto Depot shall be consummated as expeditiously as possible thereafter and on such terms as are determined by the Secretary of the Army to be in the best interest of the United States: *Provided*, That if the property is to be conveyed under any terms by which the purchase price is not paid in full simultaneously with the signing of the contract, title shall remain in the United States until full payment is made but there shall be no penalty or charges made for deferred payments.

(4) All proceeds from the sale shall be available to administer the provisions of this section and to pay any and all expenses, including land acquisition, in connection with the relocation, exchange, or sale of the San Jacinto Depot or the establishment of a fully integrated depot at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala., or all proceeds deposited into the Treasury of the United States for obligation by the Army.

(5) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, and the monetary limitation imposed by section 502 hereof shall not be inclusive of any funds required for or in connection with the San Jacinto Depot relocation.

Notwithstanding any provision of this section to the contrary the United States may retain possession of the San Jacinto depot or any part thereof until such time as facilities are substantially completed and available for use at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Shipyard Facilities

Naval Facility, Cape May, N. J.: Operational and training facilities, \$141,000.

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, S. C.: Drydock, \$10 million.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$6 million: *Provided*, however, That no more than \$500,000 of this sum shall be utilized for protective works until the Secretary of the Navy determines in his judgment that sufficient action has been taken or arrangements made to arrest further subsidence of the shipyard.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn.: Operational and training facilities, \$2,247,000.

Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$766,000.

Fleet Base Facilities

Naval Station, Newport, R. I.: Troop housing and community facilities, \$1,709,000.

Naval Base, Norfolk, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$2,546,000.

Aviation Facilities

(Naval air training stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Tex.: Troop housing, \$1,041,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$14,940,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$4,679,000.

(Fleet support air stations)

Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$114,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Fla.: Maintenance facilities, \$1,252,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$47,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nev.: Operational and training facilities, \$80,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Fentress, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, administrative facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$11,215,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, \$74,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements \$15,823,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$9,892,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, Calif.: Operational facilities and real estate, \$7 million.

Naval Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

(Marine Corps air stations)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, S. C.: Operational and training facilities and real estate, \$4,352,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,067,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,003,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$2,158,000.

(Special purpose air stations)

Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Md.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, utilities, and operational and training facilities at the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md., \$17,666,000.

Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing (including operational and training facilities and troop housing on San Nicolas Island; and maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements at Camp Cooke), \$13,841,000.

Supply Facilities

Naval Supply Depot, Newport, R. I.: Utilities, \$2,210,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Va.: Administrative facilities, \$128,000.

Naval Supply Center, Oakland, Calif.: Administrative facilities, \$146,000.

Marine Corps Facilities

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$280,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S. C.: Utilities, \$462,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,138,000.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$168,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, Calif.: Utilities, \$206,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, \$241,000.

Ordnance Facilities

Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Wash.: Maintenance facilities, \$36,000.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Calif.: Supply facilities, \$129,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, \$2,517,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, Calif.: Research, development, and test facilities, \$510,000.

Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Va.: Research, development, and test facilities, \$44,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Hingham, Mass.: Maintenance facilities, \$694,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md.: Research, development, and test facilities, \$601,000.

Service School Facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: Troop housing, \$14,200,000.

Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,184,000.

Naval Receiving Station, District of Columbia: Operational facilities, \$650,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,368,000.

Naval War College, Newport, R. I.: Operational and training facilities, \$273,000.

Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$4,643,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$4,199,000.

Medical Facilities

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md.: Hospital and medical facilities, \$8,503,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational and training facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$38,654,000.

Office of Naval Research Facilities

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development, and test facilities, \$192,000.

Outside the United States

Shipyard Facilities

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, T. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$159,000.

Aviation Facilities

Naval Air Station, Agana, Mariana Islands: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$4,414,000.

Naval Station, Bermuda, British West Indies: Operational and training facilities, \$683,000.

Naval Air Station, Ford Island, T. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,271,000.

Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Supply facilities, \$165,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, P. R.: Operational and training facilities, \$3,824,000.

Supply Facilities

Naval Supply Depot, Guam, Mariana Islands: Supply facilities, \$3,060,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Communication Unit No. 3, Asmara, Eritrea: Operational and training facilities, \$1,180,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Operational and training facilities, \$219,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Port Lyautey, Morocco: Operational and training facilities, \$519,000.

Yards and Docks Facilities

Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$890,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$75,301,000.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop naval installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real-estate actions pertaining thereto.

SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Naval Magazine, Cartagena, Spain, 46 units, and community facilities.

Naval Magazine, El Ferrol, Spain, 45 units, and community facilities.

Naval Air Station, Port Lyautey, Morocco, 330 units.

Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Italy, 122 units, and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Inside the United States

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, 277 units.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, N. C., 800 units.

Naval Facility, Cape Hatteras, N. C., 27 units.

Naval Facility, Centerville, Calif., 24 units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C., 849 units.

Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oreg., 24 units.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill., 425 units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif., 800 units.

Naval Facility, Nantucket, Mass., 19 units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn., 500 units.

Naval Facility, Pacific Beach, Wash., 30 units.

Naval Facility, Point Sur, Calif., 24 units.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Wash., 550 units.

Naval Ordnance Missile Test Facility, White Sands Proving Grounds, N. Mex., 51 units.

Outside of the United States

Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, T. H., 1,140 units.

Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, Headquarters, Camp H. M. Smith, Oahu, T. H., 168 units.

Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands, 220 units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, T. H., 650 units.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, T. H., 80 units.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, T. H., 650 units.

(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Fla., 96 units.

Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Md., 385 units.

Naval Station, Green Cove Springs, Fla., 392 units.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, 82d Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "medical facilities," with respect to the Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Va., area, strike out "\$12,815,000" and insert in place thereof "\$13,979,000."

(b) Public Law 534, 82d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$139,143,000" and "\$266,927,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$140,307,000", and "\$268,091,000."

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "\$70,656,000", and inserting in place thereof "\$72,785,000."

(b) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$70,656,000", and "\$210,704,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$72,785,000", and "\$212,833,000."

SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 201 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Marine Corps Facilities," with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif., strike out "\$648,000" and insert in place thereof "\$778,000."

(2) Under the subheading "Ordnance Facilities," with respect to the Naval Underwater Ordnance Station, Newport, R. I., strike out "\$370,000" and insert in place thereof "\$411,000."

(b) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Outside Continental United States" in section 201, as follows:

Under subheading "Aviation Facilities," with respect to the Naval Air Station, Agaña, Guam, Mariana Islands, by striking out "\$6,525,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$9,063,000" and with respect to the Naval Station, Argentina, Newfoundland, by striking out "\$8,589,800" and inserting in place thereof "\$9,089,800."

(c) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$308,463,600", "\$108,365,300", and "\$575,592,300" and inserting respectively in place thereof

"\$308,634,600", "\$111,403,300", and "\$578,801,300."

SEC. 208. (a) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Fleet Base Facilities," with respect to the Naval Station, Newport, R. I., strike out "\$11,672,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,601,000."

(2) Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities (Naval Air Training Stations)," with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Tex., strike out "\$2,247,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,569,000"; and with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Miss., strike out "\$8,231,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,141,000."

(3) Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities (Marine Corps Air Stations)," with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C., strike out "\$170,000" and insert in place thereof "\$273,000."

(4) Under the subheading "Service School Facilities," with respect to the Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Va., strike out "\$237,000" and insert in place thereof "\$300,000," and with respect to the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill., strike out "\$8,413,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,613,000."

(5) Under the subheading "Medical Facilities," with respect to the Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Ill., strike out "\$12,730,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,754,000."

(b) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 203 "\$85,939,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$86,711,000."

(c) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$303,453,000", "\$85,939,000", and "\$451,393,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$312,004,000", "\$86,711,000", and "\$460,716,000."

SEC. 209. Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities (Special Purpose Air Stations)," with respect to the Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, Calif., insert before "\$7,669,000" the words "and land acquisition."

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Air Defense Command

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minn.: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$2,649,000.

Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vt.: Troop housing, \$990,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Mont.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$10,659,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, N. Dak.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,176,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$10,673,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oreg.: Community facilities, and utilities, \$229,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,

ties, hospital facilities, and utilities, \$9,948,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$935,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,721,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,689,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, Calif.: Medical facilities, \$122,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and real estate, \$2,799,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,579,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, N. Y.: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wis.: Troop housing, and ground improvements, \$795,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$3,992,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$8,696,000.

Air Materiel Command

Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Ala.: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$975,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$1,177,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,746,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Utilities, \$157,000.

Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pa.: Supply facilities, \$94,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, \$1,560,000.

Memphis General Depot, Memphis, Tenn.: Administrative facilities, \$1,464,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, Calif.: Supply facilities, \$658,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pa.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$6,169,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,362,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$5,196,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, \$11,037,000.

Air Research and Development Command

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, Calif.: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, \$981,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$10,109,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, N. Mex.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities,

ilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$1,650,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$481,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass.: Maintenance facilities, \$165,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,884,000.

School of Aviation Medicine

School of Aviation Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, \$12 million.

Air Training Command

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$979,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$1,584,000.

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Ill.: Troop housing, \$640,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Ala.: Troop housing, \$400,000.

Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$208,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex.: Troop housing, \$750,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colo., or alternate location: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$5 million.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Ariz.: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$441,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,213,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, \$2,119,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nev.: Maintenance facilities, \$358,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Tex.: Maintenance facilities, \$319,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$245,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nev.: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$571,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,770,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$3,081,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,361,000.

Continental Air Command

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Troop housing, \$1,805,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$11,589,000.

Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Ga.: Utilities, \$172,000.

Headquarters Command

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Md.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$18,937,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, S. C.: Maintenance facilities, \$78,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$2,874,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, N. J.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,901,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Ill.: Troop housing, \$423,000.

Strategic Air Command

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,051,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, La.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,280,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,868,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,080,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Ark.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,654,000.

Brunswick Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$11,417,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Ind.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and utilities, \$7,996,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$2,257,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,578,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,734,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,939,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,174,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,404,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,346,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$3,241,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$4,094,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,703,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,489,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,493,000.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, La.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$8,401,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,795,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$897,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebr.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,250,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Ark.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,463,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$11,716,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$3,774,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,577,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,832,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$3,344,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,137,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$1,039,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$3,265,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N. H.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$940,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, N. Y.: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$208,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wis.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$15,552,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,352,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,997,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$8,431,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Mass.: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,345,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,185,000.

Tactical Air Command

George Air Force Base, Victorville, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, \$536,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Va.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,371,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, S. C.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,650,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tenn.: Troop housing, \$591,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,858,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, S. C.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,339,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,474,000.

Special Facilities

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$563,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$163,066,000.

Outside the United States**Air Materiel Command**

Various locations: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$696,000.

Alaskan Air Command

Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, \$380,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, \$710,000.

King Salmon Airport: Operational and training facilities, \$340,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$24,986,000.

Caribbean Air Command

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and training facilities, \$1,540,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$5,347,000.

Pacific Air Forces

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$144,000.

Midway Island: Supply facilities, \$839,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$15,688,000.

Strategic Air Command

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,508,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$643,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$21,431,000.

United States Air Forces in Europe

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$19,952,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$29,135,000.

Special Facilities

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$315,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$287,500,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air

Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$10 million: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Lajes Field, Azores, 306 units.

Kindley Air Force Base, Bermuda, 300 units.

Laon, France, 102 units.

Keflavik Airport, Iceland, 300 units.

Benguerir Airport, Morocco, 248 units.

Sidi Slimane Air Base, Morocco, 295 units.

Clark Air Force Base, Philippines, 900 units.

Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, 200 units.

Madrid-Torrejón area, Spain, 460 units.

Moron-San Pablo area, Spain, 40 units.

Various locations, Spain, 120 units, and community facilities.

Zaragoza Air Base, Spain, 176 units.

Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 50 units.

Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 190 units.

Bruntingthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 93 units.

Brize Norton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 215 units.

Chelveston RAF Station, United Kingdom, 79 units.

Chicksands Priory RAF Station, United Kingdom, 83 units.

Fairford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 177 units.

High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 110 units.

Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 55 units, and community facilities.

Stansted-Mountfitchet RAF Station, United Kingdom, 22 units.

Upper Heyford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 259 units.

Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, 416 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Inside the United States

Camp Adair Air Force Station, Oreg., 150 units.

Amarillo Air Force Base, Tex., 500 units.

Beale Air Force Base, Calif., 970 units.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Ind., 250 units.

Chanute Air Force Base, Ill., 450 units.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 536 units.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Okla., 50 units.

Custer Air Force Station, Mich., 169 units.
Donaldson Air Force Base, S. C., 275 units.
Cooke Air Force Base, Calif., 525 units.
Dover Air Force Base, Del., 500 units.
Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 530 units.
Duluth Municipal Airport, Minn., 365 units.
Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., 778 units.
Elsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak., 220 units.
Forbes Air Force Base, Kans., 414 units.
Custer Air Force Station, Mich., 169 units.
Fort Lee Air Force Station, Va., 154 units.
Geiger Field, Wash., 168 units.
Glasgow Air Force Base, Mont., 460 units.
Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak., 744 units.

Griffiss Air Force Base, N. Y., 270 units.
Hamilton Air Force Base, Calif., 550 units.
Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex., 400 units.
James Connally Air Force Base, Tex., 366 units.

Keesler Air Force Base, Miss., 290 units.
Kinross Air Force Base, Mich., 475 units.
K. I. Sawyer Airport, Mich., 595 units.
Kirtland Air Force Base, N. Mex., 490 units.
Lake Charles Air Force Base, La., 300 units.
Langley Air Force Base, Va., 500 units.
Larson Air Force Base, Wash., 200 units.
Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio, 400 units.
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont., 150 units.

Mather Air Force Base, Calif., 220 units.
McChord Air Force Base, Wash., 1,000 units.
McClellan Air Force Base, Calif., 540 units.
McCoy Air Force Base, Fla., 668 units.
McGuire Air Force Base, N. J., 1,450 units.
Minot Air Force Base, N. Dak., 932 units.
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 270 units.

Neills Air Force Base, Nev., 200 units.
Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, N. Y., 290 units.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr., 616 units.
Oxnard Air Force Base, Calif., 315 units.
Pease Air Force Base, N. H., 483 units.
Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wis., 900 units.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Mo., 610 units.

Robins Air Force Base, Ga., 150 units.
Seifridge Air Force Base, Mich., 580 units.
Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex., 500 units.
Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa, 235 units.

Stewart Air Force Base, N. Y., 300 units.
Suffolk County Air Force Base, N. Y., 220 units.

Syracuse Air Force Station, N. Y., 216 units.
Topsham Air Force Station, Maine, 177 units.

Truax Field, Wis., 280 units.
Turner Air Force Base, Ga., 200 units.
United States Air Force Academy, Colorado, 300 units.

Vance Air Force Base, Okla., 230 units.
Westover Air Force Base, Mass., 310 units.
Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo., 154 units.
Williams Air Force Base, Ariz., 150 units.
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich., 618 units.

Outside the United States

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, 1,050 units.

Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, 600 units.

(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:

Brookley Air Force Base, Ala., 175 units.
Carswell Air Force Base, Tex., 600 units.
Craig Air Force Base, Ala., 225 units.
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Ariz., 550 units.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyo., 500 units.

Hunter Air Force Base, Ga., 500 units.
Kelly Air Force Base, Tex., 592 units.
Lowry Air Force Base, Colo., 480 units.

March Air Force Base, Calif., 644 units.
 Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., 250 units.
 Mitchel Air Force Base, N. Y., 628 units.
 Randolph Air Force Base, Tex., 612 units.
 Reese Air Force Base, Tex., 418 units.
 Shaw Air Force Base, S. C., 400 units.
 Walker Air Force Base, N. Mex., 800 units.
 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, 2,000 units.

Sec. 305. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "Continental United States" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "Air Defense Command," with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass., strike out "\$6,076,000," and insert in place thereof "\$6,522,000."

Under the subheading "Air Materiel Command," with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out "\$14,508,000" and insert in place thereof "\$15,800,000."

(b) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "\$824,300,000" and "\$1,363,189,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$826,038,000" and "\$1,364,927,000," respectively.

Sec. 306. (a) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "Air Defense Command"—

(1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minn., strike out "\$1,469,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,636,000."

(2) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass., strike out "\$11,577,000" and insert in place thereof "\$13,341,000."

Under the subheading "Air Materiel Command," with respect to Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, strike out "\$1,339,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,661,000."

Under the subheading "Air Training Command," with respect to James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex., strike out "\$4,687,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,301,000."

Under the subheading "Strategic Air Command," with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont., strike out "\$1,586,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,726,000."

(b) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the amounts "\$11,342,000" and "\$1,447,950,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$814,349,000" and "\$1,450,957,000," respectively.

Sec. 307. (a) Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended, under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "Air Defense Command"—

(1) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Mont., strike out "\$2,048,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,390,000."

(2) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Mo., strike out "\$1,100,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,348,900."

(3) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak., strike out "\$6,804,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,507,000."

(4) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass., strike out "\$559,000" and insert in place thereof "\$615,000."

Under the subheading "Air Materiel Command," with respect to Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex., strike out "\$899,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,128,000."

Under the subheading "Air Training Command," with respect to Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Tex., strike out "\$460,000" and insert in place thereof "\$637,000."

Under the subheading "Strategic Air Command"—

(1) with respect to Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, La., strike out "\$3,344,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,633,000."

(2) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, Calif., strike out "\$7,458,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,087,000."

(3) with respect to MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Fla., strike out "\$936,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,268,000."

(4) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N. H., strike out "\$2,344,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,947,000."

(5) with respect to Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Mo., strike out "\$235,000" and insert in place thereof "\$306,000."

(b) Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "\$394,076,000" and "\$601,781,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$399,755,000" and "\$607,460,000," respectively.

Sec. 308. (a) Public Law 85-325, 85th Congress, is amended, under the heading "Alert and Dispersal of Strategic Air Command Forces" in section 1, as follows:

(1) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, N. Dak., strike out "\$895,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,892,000."

(2) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak., strike out "\$867,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,479,000."

(3) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out "\$4,380,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,479,000."

(4) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr., strike out "\$690,000" and insert in place thereof "\$969,000."

(b) Public Law 85-325, 85th Congress is amended by striking out in section 3 the amount "\$549,670,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$552,657,000."

Sec. 309. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure "\$135,425,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure "\$139,797,000."

Sec. 310. The last paragraph under the heading "Research and Development Command" in title III of Public Law 161, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 342), is amended to read as follows:

"Various locations: Research, development, and operational facilities (including not more than \$257,000 for an off-base roadway approximately 10 miles in length in the vicinity of the north boundary of Cape Canaveral—an auxiliary to Patrick Air Force Base) \$20,000,000."

The amendment made by this section is effective from March 1, 1956.

TITLE IV

Sec. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities required for advanced research projects and in connection therewith may acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the total amount of \$50 million.

The Secretary of Defense shall report in detail semiannually to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to the exercise of the authority granted by this title.

TITLE V

General provisions

Sec. 501. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 529, 40 U. S. C. 259, 267), and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary

improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$112,218,000; outside the United States, \$8,732,000; section 102, \$201,121,000; section 103, \$10,000,000; or a total of \$332,071,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$217,363,000; outside the United States, \$16,384,000; section 202, \$75,301,000; section 203, \$10,000,000; or a total of \$319,048,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$536,218,000; outside the United States, \$123,654,000; section 302, \$287,500,000; section 303, \$10,000,000; or a total of \$957,372,000.

(4) for title IV: \$50,000,000.

Sec. 503. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 percent for projects inside the United States and by 10 percent for projects outside the United States. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

Sec. 504. Any outstanding authority heretofore provided by the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991), for the provision of family housing shall be available for the construction of family housing at any installations for which appropriated fund family housing is authorized to be constructed under titles I and III of this act.

Sec. 505. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts; the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

Sec. 506. Contracts made by the United States under this act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and section 15 of the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547, 551). The Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

Sec. 507. As of July 1, 1959, all authorization for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in acts approved before August 4, 1956, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public-works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisition in whole or in part before July 1, 1959, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for family housing in the amount of \$100 million that is contained in section 302 of the act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) the authorizations for public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in sections 2231-2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886);

(5) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$30 million that is contained in title I, section 102, of the act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(6) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

(7) the authorization for public works and for the appropriation of funds that are contained in the act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended; and

(8) notwithstanding the provision of section 506 of the act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 558), the authorization for:

(a) jet engine test cells in the amount of \$1,850,000 at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., that is contained in title II, section 201 under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Aviation Facilities" of the act of August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 440, 442), as amended;

(b) ammunition storage facilities in the amount of \$225,000 at the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, Calif.; navigational aids in the amount of \$590,000 at the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, Calif.; research and development facilities in the amount of \$1,804,000 at the Naval Air Turbine Test Station, Trenton, N. J.; and navigational aids in the amount of \$400,000 at the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Wash.: that are contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Aviation Facilities" of the act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 540), as amended;

(c) the development of aviation ordnance facilities in the amount of \$2,638,000 that is contained in title II, section 202, of the act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 543), as amended;

(d) the development of ammunition storage depot and ammunition loading terminal facilities, Point-Aux-Pins Area, Ala.-Miss., in the amount of \$44,168,000 that is contained in title I, section 101, of the act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 536), as amended.

SEC. 508. Section 408 (b) of the act of June 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 236, 245), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 509. Section 515 of the act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1958 through and including 1961, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than 5,000 of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the

rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 510. Section 406 of the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1015), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of a military department may acquire any interest in land that—

"(1) he or his designee determines is needed in the interest of national defense; and

"(2) does not cost more than \$25,000 (exclusive of administrative costs and the amounts of any deficiency judgments).

This section does not authorize the acquisition, as part of the same project, of two or more contiguous parcels of land that together cost more than \$25,000."

SEC. 511. Section 408 (a) of the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(5) No determination that a project is urgently required shall be necessary for projects, the cost of which is not in excess of \$5,000."

SEC. 512. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization act except (1) housing units required to be acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) housing units leased, utilizing available operation and maintenance appropriations, for terms of 1 year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than 5 years pursuant to the provisions of section 417 of the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1018); and (3) rental guaranty family housing authorized under section 302 of the act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622); and (4) to the extent that any of the authorization of subsection 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b) of this act to construct housing at locations specified therein are not utilized, such authorization may be exercised to construct housing at other locations: *Provided*, That the total number of housing units to be constructed under the authority of this subsection may not exceed for any service 10 percent of the total number of units authorized in its subsection: *Provided, further*, That the Secretaries of the three military departments, or the designee of each, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to utilize the authority granted by this section.

TITLE VI

Reserve forces facilities

SEC. 601. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) That part of section 2233 (a) that precedes clause (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2233. Acquisition

"(a) Subject to sections 2233a, 2234, 2235, 2236, and 2238 of this title and subsection (c) of this section, the Secretary of Defense may—

(2) Section 2233 is amended by adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

"(e) The Secretary of Defense may procure advance planning, construction design, and architectural services in connection with facilities to be established or developed under this chapter which are not otherwise authorized by law."

"(f) Facilities authorized by subsection (a) shall not be considered 'military public works' under the provisions of the military construction authorization acts that repeal prior authorizations for military public works."

(3) The following new section is inserted after section 2233:

"§ 2233a. Limitation

"No expenditure or contribution that is more than \$50,000 may be made under section 2233 of this title for any facility that has not been authorized by a law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces. This requirement does not apply to the following:

"(a) Facilities acquired by lease.

"(b) Facilities acquired, constructed, expanded, rehabilitated, converted, or equipped to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed, where the Senate and the House of Representatives have been notified of that action."

(4) The analysis of chapter 133 is amended by inserting the following new item:

"2233a. Limitation."

SEC. 602. (a) Section 3 of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended by paragraph (a) of the act of August 9, 1955, chapter 662 (69 Stat. 593), and by section 2 of the act of August 29, 1957, Public Law 85-215 (71 Stat. 489), is amended by striking out the words "in an amount not to exceed \$580 million over a period of the next 8 fiscal years commencing with fiscal year 1951,"

(b) Section 3 (a) of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended by section 414 of the act of August 3, 1956, chapter 939 (70 Stat. 1018), is amended by striking out the words "and without regard to the monetary limitation otherwise imposed by this section."

SEC. 603. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

(1) For Department of the Navy:

Naval Reserve (aviation)

Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Ga.: Training facilities, \$480,000.

Naval Air Station, Dallas, Tex.: Supply facilities and utilities, \$259,000.

Naval Air Station, Denver, Colo.: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$652,000.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Ill.: Navigational aids and utilities, \$179,000.

Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Mich.: Airfield lighting, \$147,000.

Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, liquid fueling and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting, and land acquisition, \$1,992,000.

Naval Air Station, New Orleans (Avion Callender Field), La.: Administrative facilities, community facilities, navigational aids, operational facilities, supply facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,447,000.

Naval Air Station, New York, N. Y.: Airfield lighting, \$130,000.

Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$652,000.

Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, \$570,000.

Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Mass.: Utilities, \$407,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pa.: Utilities, \$99,000.

Naval Reserve (surface)

Alameda, Calif.: Waterfront operational facilities, \$128,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Bloomington, Ind.: Training facilities, \$95,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Boston, Mass.: Training facilities, \$108,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Centralia, Wash.: Training facilities, \$81,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Chillicothe, Ohio: Training facilities, \$100,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Danville, Ky.: Training facilities, \$84,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Dunkirk, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$79,000.

Fort Schuyler, N. Y.: Waterfront operational facilities, \$120,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Hayward, Calif.: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$99,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Honolulu, Hawaii: Training facilities, \$515,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Iowa City, Iowa: Training facilities, \$97,000.

Master Control Radio Station, New Orleans, La.: Communications, \$210,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Olympia (Tumwater), Wash.: Training facilities, \$47,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Pasadena, Calif.: Training facilities, \$132,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Port Chicago, Calif.: Training facilities, \$94,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Jose, Calif.: Land acquisition, \$78,000.

St. Petersburg, Fla.: Waterfront operational facilities, \$26,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Steubenville, Ohio: Land acquisition, \$18,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, White Oak (Lewiston), Md.: Training facilities, \$557,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Yakima, Wash.: Training facilities, \$48,000.

Marine Corps Reserve (ground)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Lynchburg, Va.: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$388,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Memphis, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$453,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Moline, Ill.: Training facilities, \$152,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Pasadena, Calif.: Training facilities, \$163,000.

(2) For Department of the Air Force:

Air Force Reserve

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Md.: Operational and training facilities, \$129,000.

Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Ind.: Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$3,174,000.

Bates Field, Mobile, Ala.: Maintenance facility, \$97,000.

Bradley Field, Windsor Locks, Conn.: Maintenance facility and utilities and ground improvements, \$160,000.

Davis Field, Muskogee, Okla.: Maintenance facility, and supply facility, \$325,000.

General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wis.: Maintenance facility, and operational and training facilities, \$173,000.

Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, N. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$180,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Belton, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, \$101,000.

Naval Air Station (Alvin Callender Field), Orleans Parish, La.: Operational and training facilities, \$622,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pa.: Maintenance facility, \$93,000.

Air National Guard of the United States

Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, and hospital and medical facilities, \$171,000.

Barnes Field, Westfield, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, \$740,000.

Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel, Minn.: Site improvements, \$500,000.

Birmingham Municipal Airport, Birmingham, Ala.: Operational and training facilities, \$150,000.

Byrd Field, Richmond, Va.: Supply facilities, \$50,000.

Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wis.: Operational and training facilities, \$579,000.

Capital Airport, Springfield, Ill.: Supply facilities, \$78,000.

Des Moines Municipal Airport, Des Moines, Iowa: Operational and training facilities, \$53,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,308,000.

Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, N. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$170,000.

Gulfport Municipal Airport, Gulfport, Miss.: Supply facilities, \$362,000.

Hayward Municipal Airport, Hayward, Calif.: Operational and training facilities \$113,000.

Hensley Field, Grand Prairie, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,862,000.

Hubbard Field, Reno, Nev.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$159,000.

Kellogg Field, Battle Creek, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,136,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$570,000.

Martinsburg Municipal Airport, Martinsburg, W. Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$123,000.

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Ill.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,099,000.

Ontario International Airport, Ontario, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$127,000.

Portland Municipal Airport, Portland, Oreg.: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, \$233,000.

Rosecrans Field, St. Joseph, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$123,000.

San Juan International Airport, San Juan, P. R.: Supply facilities, \$70,000.

Sky Harbor Airport, Phoenix, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, \$655,000.

Standiford Field, Louisville, Ky.: Operational and training facilities, and administrative facilities, \$715,000.

Theodore F. Green Airport, Providence, R. I.: Operational and training facilities, \$213,000.

Travis Field, Savannah, Ga.: Housing, supply facilities and utilities, \$317,000.

Various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, \$300,000.

(3) For Department of the Army:

Army Reserve

Batavia, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$171,000.

Beckley, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$289,000.

Beloit, Wis.: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Canandaigua, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$171,000.

Canton, Ohio: Training facilities, \$40,000.

Cheyenne, Wyo.: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Durant, Okla.: Training facilities, \$141,000.

Fargo, N. Dak.: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Fremont, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Galesburg, Ill.: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Greenwood, S. C.: Training facilities, \$85,000.

Hempstead, N. Y. (Nr2): Training facilities, \$536,000.

Johnstown, Pa.: Training facilities, \$99,000.

Kewaunee, Wis.: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Madison, Wis. (Nr2): Training facilities, \$490,000.

Oklahoma City, Okla. (Nr2): Training facilities, \$443,000.

St. Mary's, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.

St. Mary's, Pa.: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Salinas, Calif.: Training facilities, \$164,000.

Sinton, Tex.: Training facilities, \$134,000.

Stockton, Calif.: Training facilities, \$164,000.

Warren, Ohio: Training facilities, \$289,000.

Weirton, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Land acquisition: Training facilities, \$419,000.

Army National Guard of the United States (armory)

Ackerman, Miss.: Training facilities, \$54,000.

Agawam, Mass.: Training facilities, \$170,000.

Ashford, Ala.: Training facilities, \$70,000.

Beckley, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$200,000.

Belton, S. C.: Training facilities, \$122,000.

Berryville, Ark.: Training facilities, \$45,000.

Berryville, Va.: Training facilities, \$135,000.

Bethel, Alaska: Training facilities, \$480,000.

Caldwell, Ohio: Training facilities, \$135,000.

Calhoun, Ga.: Training facilities, \$110,000.

Chester, Pa.: Training facilities, \$206,000.

Espanola, N. Mex.: Training facilities, \$57,000.

Fairbanks, Alaska: Training facilities, \$277,000.

Gainesville, Tex.: Training facilities, \$111,000.

Hollister, Calif.: Training facilities, \$105,000.

Honey Grove, Tex.: Training facilities, \$90,000.

Juncos, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, \$38,000.

Livingston, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.

Lovell, Wyo.: Training facilities, \$142,000.

Mayaguez, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, \$160,000.

Middleboro, Ky.: Training facilities, \$130,000.

Northwest St. Paul, Minn.: Training facilities, \$130,000.

Pitman, N. J.: Training facilities, \$175,000.

Rigby, Idaho: Training facilities, \$57,000.

Salem, S. Dak.: Training facilities, \$150,000.

Saranac Lake, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$300,000.

Shallotte, N. C.: Training facilities, \$95,000.

Smithfield, N. C.: Training facilities, \$98,000.

South Portland, Maine: Training facilities, \$150,000.

Sturgis, Mich.: Training facilities, \$220,000.

Swanton, Vt.: Training facilities, \$137,000.

Valparaiso, Ind.: Training facilities, \$188,000.

Whitman, Mass.: Training facilities, \$170,000.

Whitmire, S. C.: Training facilities, \$99,000.

Winnemucca, Nev.: Training facilities, \$110,000.

Army National Guard of the United States (nonarmory)

Augusta, Maine: Administrative facilities, \$90,000.

Burlington, Vt.: Supply facilities, \$208,000.

Camp Beauregard, La.: Supply facilities, \$325,000.

Camp Dodge, Iowa: Supply facilities, \$120,000.

Concord, N. H.: Supply facilities, \$145,000.

Kalispell, Mont.: Maintenance facilities, \$67,000.

Trenton, N. J.: Maintenance facilities, \$80,000.

(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection.

SEC. 604. The first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, does not apply to—

(a) facilities that—

(1) have been the subject of consultation with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives before July 1, 1958;

(2) are under contract before July 1, 1960; and

(3) are funded from appropriations made before the date of enactment of this act; or

(b) facilities that are authorized by section 603 (4) of this act; or

(c) The following facilities for the Air National Guard of the United States.

(1) Milford Point, Conn.: Operational and training facilities, \$337,000.

(2) Wellesley, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, \$319,000.

(3) Westchester County Airport, White Plains, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, \$105,000.

SEC. 605. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this Title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and section 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 606. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 603 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$11,886,000.

(2) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air Force Reserve, \$5,054,000;

(b) Air National Guard of the United States, \$11,976,000.

(3) for Department of the Army: Army Reserve and Army National Guard of the United States, \$11,042,000.

SEC. 607. Any of the amounts named in section 603 of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses 1, 2 (a), 2 (b), and 3 of section 606 respectively.

SEC. 608. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1958."

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further

reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in its entirety, and that it be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against paragraph 4 of section 110 which appears on page 18 of the bill. This paragraph is on appropriation in a bill from a committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations, and is in violation of rule 21, paragraph 4.

Specifically, this provides that funds from the sale of the San Jacinto Ammunition Depot shall be available to the Secretary of the Army to pay any and all expenses, including land acquisition, in connection with the relocation, change, or sale of the San Jacinto Depot or for the establishment of a fully integrated depot at a specified location in Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. VINSON. I do not desire to be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman. I concede the point of order. Therefore, paragraph 4, if the Chair sustains the point of order, will be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia concedes the point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. How much of this language in section 110 is now stricken?

The CHAIRMAN. Paragraph 4, starting in line 10 and ending in line 17 on page 18.

Mr. GROSS. Only paragraph 4?

The CHAIRMAN. That is all.

The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered in bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendments as follows:

On page 2, line 22, strike "\$1,795,000" and insert "\$795,000."

On page 4, following line 11, add the following: "facilities, and hospital facilities, \$3,505,000."

On page 9, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following: "Fort Bragg, N. C., 367 units."

On page 18, line 8, place a period after the word "made" and strike the remainder of that line and all of line 9.

On page 18, line 25, strike the word "to."

On page 19, following line 3, insert "Title II."

On page 29, following line 14, insert the following:

"Naval Base, San Diego, Calif., 1,000 units."

On page 53, strike all of line 14.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARENDS: Page 16, line 24, strike out all of section 110, and insert:

"Sec. 110. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to sell the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Tex., at not less than fair market value as determined by the Secretary of the Army and to convey by quitclaim deed all right, title and interest, of the United States in and to said depot, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be in the public interest: *Provided*, That if such authority is exercised by the Secretary of the Army, it shall be subject to the following:

"A. The United States may retain possession of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot or any part thereof until such time as substitute facilities are substantially completed and available for use at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala.

"B. The San Jacinto Ordnance Depot property shall be advertised for sale by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on behalf of and under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army.

"C. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Army such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, including land acquisition, the sale and relocation of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, and the establishment of a fully integrated depot at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala. The monetary limitation imposed by section 502 hereof shall not be inclusive of any funds required for or in connection with the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot relocation."

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to speak for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, first let me say I am pleased that the gentleman who represents the Houston, Tex., area in such an able manner is present on the floor of the House. He knows my intent. He knows my high regard for him. He knows, of course, there is nothing personal involved in my approach to this San Jacinto Depot matter before us. I am offering this amendment, to make it permissive rather than mandatory, as presently set forth in this bill, for the movement of the depot. I think this merits the close attention of the House. It is one of great importance.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished committee chairman [Mr. VINSON] has fully outlined what is embodied in this bill. I am in favor of the bill, except for one section, and it is solely to this that I should like to direct your attention.

What is proposed in this section is unprecedented, and I firmly believe that it would be a grave error to allow this section to remain in the bill as now written.

I call your attention to section 110, beginning at the bottom of page 16. This section relates to the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot in Houston, Tex.

Section 110 would require the Army to move its depot and outloading facility from Houston, Tex., to an area known as Point-Aux-Pins in Alabama.

The language permits of no exercise of discretion on the part of the Army. The language does not say that this movement would be made if the defense of the country would be better served thereby. It just flatly tells the Army to move the depot regardless of any other considerations, whether of a defense nature or of a fiscal nature.

This matter has been before the Armed Services Committee for several years. And I might say that I never actually believed that language would ever be inserted in the bill requiring the Army to move the San Jacinto Depot. But it is in the bill today. I would like to relate very briefly the history of this depot and its proposed movement.

In 1956, upon representations that the depot should be moved, the committee and the Congress authorized a study to be made for the purpose of determining where the depot should go. In effect, the study indicated that should it ever be moved, Point-Aux-Pins, Ala., was the proper place for it to be moved to. The study did not indicate any reasons why the movement should be made, however.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] appeared before the committee and detailed the reasons why he thought the movement should be made. I subsequently restudied his testimony and I believe I am correct in saying that his argument is based on two factors. The first of these is that the depot constitutes a hazard to the life and health of the people in that area. And the second, is that the land has become so valuable that it is wasteful to have it used as an ammunition depot and outloading facility.

I would like to deal with each of these arguments separately. With respect to the question of danger, I can only say that the experts within the Department of the Army state that this depot not only is safe—and they give details as to why it is safe—but that it is the safest facility of its kind in the whole United States.

I hasten to say that in saying that it is the safest facility of its kind, the Army is not intimating that it is only relatively safe. The Army means simply that it does not constitute any danger under its present operation to the people in the area.

The depot is located on the Houston ship channel. The outloading facilities are, of course, on the water's edge. And in time of war or national emergency when the outloading facilities would be used, they would constitute a danger in exactly the same fashion and to the same extent that any such facility would. But I want to make it entirely clear that these outloading facilities are not used and will not be used except under war or emergency conditions. And if we are under conditions of this kind, not only will the people in the city of Houston be in danger but also every individual in the United States regardless of where he is located.

The depot in the performance of its storage activities is harmless. And that is the only function it performs today.

Attempts have been made to draw an analogy between this and the Texas City

disaster and the disaster at the naval magazine, Port Chicago, Calif. The analogy, I can assure you, is a remote one. In the first place, the Texas City disaster did not involve, primarily, shipments of ammunition at all. Nor did it involve ships of the Army or the Navy. Also, all of the other circumstances attendant upon this unfortunate happening bears little or no resemblance to the situation at Houston.

With respect to the Port Chicago explosion, it is pointed out that ships were being loaded during the war and this is always a ticklish and dangerous operation. It would be a dangerous operation at Houston, too. But this activity would be carried on at Houston only if we were in an emergency situation where all of us must, in one way or another, participate in the common danger.

Also, at Port Chicago, the only persons killed or injured were those actually engaged in the loading activity. Not one single person in the town of Port Chicago was even injured. It was only those who were on the docks at the time who were affected.

So, I hope I have made clear that these other disasters are not in any way similar to the situation that exists at San Jacinto today. It is a perfectly safe depot operation with, the experts tell me, no danger whatsoever to the surrounding area.

The second principal argument made by the gentleman from Texas—and I might say that I regret that I must take the position that I do as strongly as I do—the gentleman's second argument is that the property has now become too valuable to use as an ordnance depot.

Now, this is a consideration. I could see an argument of this kind generating a good bit of sympathy. I can visualize a situation where property was developed as a tank farm or an automotive parking area 10 years ago on land that has now become very valuable because of the growing community in that particular area. In a case such as this, I would say—in complete agreement with the gentleman—that the tank farm should be moved and the property put to more productive use—or, as the property appraisers call it, its highest and best use.

But here we have an installation specifically and deliberately located on a channel giving it access to the gulf and to the ocean. This site was not selected in any haphazard fashion. It was selected after a study of the requirements for a depot and outloading facility. Such an activity, of necessity, must be in a place very similar to where the San Jacinto Depot is now. It cannot be just anywhere at all.

After the Army selected this site, it spent many millions of dollars in improving it. It has 5,000 acres, 281 permanent buildings, 18 miles of railroad, 415,000 square feet of igloo or magazine storage and all of the other many facilities that such an installation has to have.

Today there is stored at San Jacinto 80,000 short tons of ammunition valued at \$120 million.

I would raise this question: Is the Federal Government to be penalized for its foresight in selecting properties of

this kind? Can we extend this concept to the place where every time the United States purchased property and developed it and it later on became very valuable that it should be abandoned and turned over to private interests? The answer to this is very obvious. The answer is "No."

So I trust I have made it clear that, first, the depot is a safe one, and second, that the argument that the property is too valuable simply will not stand up.

And speaking of costs, the Army estimates that it will cost a minimum of \$44 million to construct the new facility at Point-Aux-Pins. I might mention that not even the land has been acquired at Point-Aux-Pins since the Army never intended to build this Point-Aux-Pins facility until there was a mobilization requirement for it under emergency or war conditions. So, added to the other reasons why this depot should not be moved is the taxpayers of the United States who, I feel, find it a little bit difficult to understand why we abandon one facility—a perfectly good one—and build another. I can hear my own constituency telling me that they, in the past, have wondered why the military services continued to build additional facilities when there were so many installations being closed. This is a question I would rather not be called upon to answer with respect to this case.

Now, let us suppose that the House disagrees with me, and the language remains in the bill in its present mandatory form. What does this mean for the future? It means that we will have established a precedent that will come back to haunt the Congress as long as there are military construction bills—or as long as we have a military establishment. San Jacinto is not alone. San Jacinto is one of a great many facilities throughout the country which is constructed on property which subsequently became very valuable. Some of these other facilities have their own elements of disturbance to the local populace. B-52's make a lot of noise. Are we going to move our B-52 bases to isolated areas and abandon the investment we now have in the existing fields? Pretty soon we are going to have facilities on our east and west coasts for loading the Polaris missile into submarines. I have no detailed information with respect to any dangers which may be involved in this operation but I suppose that there are some.

No, we cannot accept arguments of this kind if for no other reason than that we would be embarking on a program to relocate hundreds of millions—perhaps billions—worth of installations.

Now, I am not unsympathetic with the position of the gentleman from Texas. I do not for a minute doubt the sincerity of his belief that this is a dangerous facility nor do I doubt his belief that the property is not being put to its highest and best use. Simply stated, I do not agree with the gentleman's conclusions. I have taken the same set of facts and presumably have received the same information and advice as the gentleman from Texas, but

my conclusion is that we should not force the Army to move the San Jacinto Depot.

Since no one of us is perfect, and since there is, of course, the possibility—although I consider it a remote one—that this facility should be moved from its present location, I would suggest that as an alternative to the mandatory language which the gentleman desires, there be inserted in the bill permissive language. This, I think would place the responsibility in the proper place—with the Army. I do not wish to take it upon myself to tell the Army that it should or should not have a certain number of ammunition depots and out-loading facilities at particular locations. I am not qualified to make judgments of that kind. And I don't think many Members of this House are qualified to make these judgments. Let us provide permissive authority which would allow the Army to move the depot if in their best judgment it should be moved, but let us not force it on them.

I have in my hand a letter addressed to the Honorable CARL E. VINSON, chairman, Committee on Armed Services, signed by Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, dated June 20, 1958, reading as follows:

JUNE 20, 1958.

HON. CARL E. VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have before me the draft of H. R. 13015 wherein section 110 thereof requires the mandatory removal of the Army facilities from the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Tex.

Assistant Secretary Higgins whom you so kindly permitted to state the Army position before your committee presented the Army views in detail. I do not wish to belabor you with repetitious detail; the principle involved, to me, is of much greater import. Secretary Higgins' presentation included some draft legislation for a more deliberate approach which I only agreed to with considerable reluctance.

I believe that I would be remiss in my duties as Secretary of the Army if I did not make known to you my objection to such proposed legislation. While I am cognizant of the authority of Congress in such matters, I am nevertheless deeply concerned with the implications of the proposed legislation with respect to the basic responsibility of the Department of the Army for determining those facilities and installations required to fulfill its missions.

I bespeak your good offices to do everything in your power to prevent this mandate upon the Army from being enacted. Sincerely,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.

In conclusion, I should like to point out one thing more. As you read the mandatory language in the bill, you quickly note that this land will not be disposed of in the usual manner, where it is turned over to the General Services Administration, but rather it will be put up for public sale on the courthouse steps or some place else, and then it will go to the highest bidder who has the money to buy 5,000 acres of valuable land. That is not following normal procedure. Who gets it is beside the point, but why this special method. It seems to me that making this language per-

missive is the desirable procedure, and I hope you will vote in the best interests of the public and the taxpayers. There is a fundamental principle involved.

MR. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MR. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit embarrassed because I am talking for my own district. Well, we will do the best we can. And, my friend from Illinois is my friend and I am his. We have been friends and we will continue to be for a long time, because he is going to stay here and I hope I am, too. And, he was very frank with you and I am going to be frank, too, and I am going to talk in my own way and I am going to try to talk a little horse-sense to you.

The Army does not want to get out and they are not going to get out. They have so stated. The language in the committee bill makes it mandatory they must leave in 18 months. Of course, the amendment by my lovable and able friend makes it permissive, and if you adopt his language, they will frankly tell you "We will never get out, because your language does not make us get out."

Now, there is nothing wrong with the language. The committee clerks helped prepare it. And the sale is under the control of the able and distinguished Secretary of the Army, and I think he has got sense enough to sell it right, and if he listens to me—and I hope he reads this language—he will cut it up into small tracts, and then business people can come and buy it and it will bring a whole lot more money that way. And, Mr. Secretary, I hope you will read those words and I know you will do the right thing and cut it up in small tracts.

Now, why get rid of this thing? It is a health hazard; it is an economic burden on the community. And I plead guilty; I helped put it down there during the war. In 1941 our ordnance people said, "We have to have it." And I said, "Come on down in my section. You are already within 3 miles of there with 2 other propositions, a tank plant, a gun-barrel plant. Come on. We are patriotic. We will go with you and we will help you get the land." What did my folks do? My chamber of commerce went out and scoured that country to cooperate and came up with what? Five thousand acres of that land. It is shaped like a pencil. Five miles of waterfront, the most valuable land in the country. They paid \$450 an acre for it. It is worth \$3,000, \$4,000, and \$5,000 an acre now. I have been on the phone the last 2 or 3 days and my people say that is a conservative figure.

Now, let us see what happened here. About a year ago, or 2 years ago, there was a meeting in Secretary Bob Anderson's office. There were 6 or 7 mayors of towns close to the depot, the president of the chamber of commerce, and the county judge, and the president of the

port commission—I do not know whether Senator LYNDON JOHNSON was there or whether his assistant was there—and Senator PRICE DANIEL was and myself. We met in Secretary Anderson's office. He was then Under Secretary of the Armed Services. He called in Mr. Higgins, the gentleman who was in the War Department and who was quoted in the letter. He said, "Mr. Higgins, I am familiar with this project down there. It is a health hazard, it is an economic hazard, it is a burden to the community down there. Get rid of it." And 12 or 15 or 20 people heard him.

That was Secretary Anderson, now Secretary of the Treasury. At that time he was Under Secretary of the Armed Services. Shortly thereafter he resigned from Government service. And, lo and behold, my able and likable friend, Mr. Higgins, did not wait hardly long enough for Mr. Anderson to get out of town, before he came over to my office and said, "I have to have some legislative authority to move that depot."

Now when Mr. Anderson says, "Go on and move it," he does not need any authority. He already has it. You know it and I know it, and every time we try to give him some authority he says, "I do not want it now."

Mr. Chairman, we are not asking anything but what is right and just and honorable. My people pay taxes, just as yours do, and by no stretch of the imagination will it cost the taxpayers in excess of \$2.5 million to move that depot, over what the land and equipment will sell for. Otherwise, they would have to air condition every igloo that they put up, and they would have to have a dancehall in practically all the buildings.

Do you know what this thing cost, land and everything, down there? It cost only \$16,350,000—less than \$16.5 million. Now Mr. Higgins says in a letter—and I have it right here—written by my able friend, Mr. Higgins, in December 1957, that it cost \$30 million to replace the depot. Six or eight months later he said it cost \$33 million. And, lo and behold, he went to the committee the other day and said that it cost \$44 million. I guess he is going to air condition every igloo and put a dance hall in every one of those buildings. He is puffing his cost figures.

Mr. Chairman, it could not possibly cost more than \$20 million or \$25 million at most, and that land down there will just about bring us out. Here is the able gentleman from Alabama Mr. Boykin and he says, "I want to put it on deep water, 20,000 or 25,000 acres, and if it goes up it is not going to hurt anybody, and I will buy the land at \$50 an acre."

How unreasonable can anyone be, to put an ammunition depot in the heart of a great industrial area on land that is worth from \$3,000 to \$5,000 an acre, when it ought to be out in the hinterland so, if it goes up, nobody is going to get hurt. Nobody thought Texas City would go up, either. I am not an explosives expert, but all I know is that 600 people are still dead and hundreds

of them are mangled. And if this ammunition depot goes up, with a dozen refineries and chemical plants around there, it will make the Texas City disaster look like a firecracker. I hope it never goes up, but who can guarantee that it will not?

Mr. Chairman, I am not asking anything unreasonable. I think Secretary Bob Anderson had a good knowledge of the situation. He said it was a health hazard, an economic hazard. And I make you one proposition and I think it is a sound one. The taxpayers of this country have had a tremendous burden on their shoulders since 1939 to support the armed services. They represent 65 percent or 75 percent of our total national expenditures, and, as far as we know, we are going to have to bear that burden, 5, 10, 15, 20 years longer—who knows? We are going to have to do it.

If the Army is in a community and the Army is an economic burden to that community and a health hazard to it, why should not the Army get out? Who supports the Army? Is it the country? Or does the Army support the country. I never heard of the Army supporting the country. It is the country that supports the Army, is it not?

This country is large enough and great enough, there is room enough here for all of us. Put these installations where they are not going to hurt, because these communities that are suffering have to pay taxes to support themselves and also to support the Army.

I do hope you will vote down the amendment offered by my able friend. He is not being personal, I know that. I admire him and I respect him. We usually think alike. But this ammunition dump ought to be moved. We can get large tracts of cheap land at \$50 an acre on water where it is not going to hurt anybody if it should go up. Sell this land. Let the Army sell it. Under this language in the bill now the Army has direct control. It is their job to dispose of it. I repeat, let them cut it up in small tracts, and they will get a tremendous amount of money. Under no circumstance can I imagine that it would cost in excess of what that land will bring, more than \$2.5 million to replace it.

I humbly apologize to all of you for talking so long, but my people want you to help them get rid of this hazard.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas who just addressed the House talks in terms of constructing another ordnance depot in 18 months, and under the terms of this bill, if he is correct, the Army would have to abandon the ordnance depot in San Jacinto in 18 months. I wonder if another ordnance depot could be constructed on the salt flats or swamplands of Alabama in 18 months. I find nothing in the

hearings to indicate how long it would take to construct such a depot.

Mr. VINSON. While I do not recall any particular testimony as to the length of time, the type of installation that would be required to remove the ammunition can all be constructed within 18 months. I took the responsibility of fixing 18 months because that is generally what is required in other installations of this character.

Mr. GROSS. I found nothing in the hearings to indicate that.

Mr. Chairman, I can understand, I think, why Secretary Anderson would like to move this depot, because, as I understand it, he is also a Texan. I can understand, too, the reason why Texas might want another 5,000 acres at this time. Statehood for Alaska has just gone through, and Alaska will be a larger State than Texas.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Perhaps the Secretary of the Treasury did come from Texas, but I want the gentleman to know that the distinguished Secretary lives in my own hometown of Greenwich, Conn., now.

Mr. GROSS. That is fine. I am glad he has 2 or 3 homes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I think it should be made clear that this installation is 15 miles from the border of the city of Houston.

Mr. GROSS. From reading the hearings I do not know whether it is 25 or 15 miles.

Mr. ARENDS. It is 15 miles, and there is barren land between the city boundary and this installation.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to read from the hearings the testimony of Secretary Higgins of the Defense Department. Addressing the gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished Chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, he said:

San Jacinto is one of the safest ammunition depots in the country. * * *

The Army has continued to advise the Congress that we wish to retain San Jacinto in its present location. * * *

San Jacinto is a permanent installation in excellent repair, and strategically well located to perform its mission.

Then, he goes on to say:

This facility performed admirably during World War II, and was of major importance during the Korean war.

Three hundred thousand tons of ammunition, he said, were outloaded from this facility during the Korean fighting. Talk about hazards, there was no trouble in handling 300,000 tons in 6 months during the Korean war out of this particular facility. When the gentleman from Texas mentioned Texas City a while ago, he was not talking in terms of ammunition. The Texas City explosion occurred because apparently they were handling broken bags of nitrate

along with loose sulfur. They were not handling ammunition at Texas City, and the two situations cannot possibly be compared. The Army did outload 300,000 tons of ammunition in a 6 month's period out of this San Jacinto Ordnance Depot and it was accomplished without the least trouble.

As the gentleman from Illinois stated a while ago, and I would like to reread this portion of Secretary Higgins' testimony before the committee. He said:

The installation consists of 281 buildings which, with minor exceptions, are of permanent construction. It is surrounded by 61,000 feet of chain-link fence. There are 18 miles of railroad trackage; 202 igloos and 7 magazines; 7 warehouses; 150 open-storage sites with earth barricades; 270,000 square feet of open, improved storage area; administrative support facilities; a slip 4,357 feet long by 250 feet wide and 36 feet deep; a pier for 2 vessels, 1,500 feet long, and a tugboat dock, 120 feet long. In addition, there are 43 miles of roads, plus walks, bridges, trestles, platforms, parking areas, and operational buildings.

I imagine most of these roads are paved; certainly they are all-weather roads.

No wonder they want these 5,000 acres with 43 miles of paved roads, miles of trackage and so forth.

Then Secretary Higgins goes on to say:

Mr. Chairman, it must be realized that, in the event the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot were to be relocated, a precedent would be established which could well result in the relocation of other similarly situated Army installations.

Of course, that is exactly what will happen if this bill is passed without the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. We will be establishing a precedent and there will be all kinds of bills here seeking relief in similar situations and calling for the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Without being facetious at all, I think we must admit that there is absolutely no danger from this facility except in case of war, and let me say to our good colleagues of the House that if the time comes when war comes to America, we will not be worrying about explosives on the ground, but we will be worrying about explosives coming from the air above.

Mr. GROSS. As Secretary Higgins said and I quote his exact words from the hearings:

I wish to point out again, as I have previously, that the depot's storage facilities do not constitute a health or safety hazard.

Those are his precise and exact words from the hearings.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill is passed without the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, it will constitute what I will have to call the Texas land grab of 1958.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. ARENDS) there were—ayes 57, noes 65.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ARENDS and Mr. Brooks of Louisiana.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 82, noes 84.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. On page 39, line 11, appear the words "Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colo., or alternate location" and the sum of \$5 million.

Could the chairman inform me what the object and purpose of that authorized action?

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado that the intent of that section, which reads "Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colo., or alternate location: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$5 million," is to bring about the removal of the North American Defense Headquarters from Colorado Springs and concentrate it all at Lowry Air Force Base. That is what that language is intended to do.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILSON of California: On page 29, following line 13, change the period to a comma and add the following language: "to be constructed on land, including the following tracts which are hereby authorized and directed to be transferred to the Department of the Navy by the Administrator of General Services without reimbursement: GSA H-Cal 446D; GSA H-Cal 546-B; and GSA H-Cal 587."

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical amendment, and I will explain it briefly. It allows the Navy to have transferred to it some 407 acres of land which is now under the control of the General Services Administration for use of the 1,000 Capehart units that have been approved in this bill. All this does is to expedite transfer without reimbursement by the Navy.

The 1,000 units of Capehart housing can be developed on 3 pieces of property comprising 407 acres of land located within the city limits of San Diego some 5 miles north of the downtown area. These three properties were developed during the war period with defense housing. The housing has now been removed and the sites are available. Utilities and services, including some streets, are already in place. The 407 acres of land contain approximately 288 acres of land usable for housing. The transfer of this land from the Public Housing Authority to the Navy without reimbursement is desirable and nec-

essary. It will provide land without the necessity of buying private property and removing it from the tax rolls. If the transfer were not made without reimbursement, it would be necessary for the Navy to procure additional funds to provide for reimbursement. The 1959 budget has already been presented to the Congress and if the transfer is not made without reimbursement it might delay the construction of these urgently required Capehart housing units until next year when funds could be requested. These sites provide the best and most convenient locations for housing of this type without the necessity for purchasing extremely valuable property. No formal appraisal has been made for the value of these lands but it is estimated they are worth between \$500,000 and \$1 million.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman has presented his amendment to me, and personally I have no objection to accepting the amendment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to the amendment on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUBSER: On page 80, following line 9, add a new item as follows:

"San Jose, Calif., road improvements, \$32,000."

(Mr. GUBSER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman has submitted his amendment to us. We are thoroughly conversant with it. We know what it is. There is no objection to accepting the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we will be glad to accept it on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services a question relative to the outside of the United States family housing units on page 29 and the top of page 30. It is my understanding that the housing units that are listed on page 29 have already been contracted for and that this is merely a reauthorization.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentlemen from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Those listed on page 29 have not been contracted for, otherwise they would not be in the bill. The

reason they are in the bill is that the law requires a line item for all those that have not been contracted for prior to June 30, just last month. And, these have not been contracted for.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Well, may I then go on to the item at the top of page 30, for which a letter of acceptability was issued on April 29, 1958? It is my understanding that that letter has since been revoked. However, the original letter of acceptability provides the bidder a 30-day period in which to appeal, and I simply want to make clear for the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, that this new authorization is merely for the purpose of making sure that the housing is built and will not in any way take away the rights of the bidder under the original letter of acceptability.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman has stated it absolutely correctly.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the chairman.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 61, after line 10, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 311. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized and directed to enter into a contract or contracts for the sale of the Air Force installations at Wold-Chamberlain Field, Minneapolis, Minn., within 18 months from the date of this act."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, there are two Air Force and a Naval Air installations on Wold-Chamberlain Field, which is the commercial airfield for the Twin Cities, located on the edge, in fact, partly within, my congressional district. These installations are not just health hazards as the gentleman from Texas has described the ammunition dump 15 miles from Houston; they are a death dealer. We have had military jetplanes crash repeatedly, 5 or 6 times in 2 years, into my district. One of them killed 6 children playing in the street, and the parents of 3 of them, who were in one of the farmhouses destroyed. My folks have properly been pressing me to get those military air operations out of Wold-Chamberlain Field. Now that we have voted to remove a possible hazard from Houston, I think, without question, we should vote to remove a proved hazard from Minneapolis. I hope the gentleman from Georgia will accept by amendment. I should really introduce a similar amendment to title II, directing the naval air forces to get out within 18 months also, because the Navy has a large air installation there too. I hope we can direct the Air Force and the Navy to get those jetplanes out of Wold-Chamberlain Field within 18 months. Will the gentleman accept my amendment?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. Certainly.

Mr. VINSON. You ask by your amendment to sell and dispose of an active military installation that is being used today, and nothing being constructed to take its place anywhere else. Now, I do not think this committee or the House would be justified to sell what

is known as Wold-Chamberlain Airfield that has military planes and installations on it today, this afternoon.

Mr. JUDD. What I asked was not that we sell Wold-Chamberlain Airfield, but that we sell or dispose of the military installations on it, and get those jet planes out of there so my people will be safe and able to relax in quiet and security. I cannot see any reason why we should take a potential hazard away from the vicinity of Houston, where they have never had any difficulty, and do nothing about an actually proved safety hazard, a death dealer in my congressional district.

Mr. VINSON. Does the gentleman think he is in the same position as Houston? There we have an alternate base to which to go. In the gentleman's case we have no place where we can take this installation. The gentleman is proposing just to close it up immediately. We cannot do business that way. Let the gentleman offer his proposal, give us an opportunity to study it, and, if the facts warrant it, I have no hesitancy in saying that the Congress will do the same in his case as they have done with Houston.

Mr. JUDD. We have been trying for years to get the military flying removed.

Mr. VINSON. This is the first time this matter has been brought to the attention of the committee.

Mr. JUDD. I just want to give the House a sample of the demands you are going to get from all over the United States if the action stands that you have just taken with respect to Houston.

Mr. VINSON. I do think Congress is composed of sensible men and that they will not do these things.

Mr. JUDD. At Bethel, Minn., just north of Minneapolis, some 20 miles away, in the district of my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER], the Air Force has approved a new air base for these military planes. They have been fiddling around with it for a long time. This bill keeps it alive, no more, with a \$500,000 authorization. Why not give them \$44 million as in Alabama, and direct them to get on their horse, or their plane, if you will, and finish that base at Bethel, so that in the next 18 months, they can remove those military planes from Wold-Chamberlain that are killing people in my district?

Mr. VINSON. The project down in Texas has been pending before the Committee on Armed Services for 3 years.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman is able to get action when he wants it. The Texas job is to be completed in 18 months.

Mr. VINSON. But in Texas we have some place to go.

Mr. JUDD. Have you actually bought the land in Alabama to which to move? The gentleman from Texas said first that he thought you could get it for \$50 an acre and then he said something about getting it for \$25 an acre. Which is it? We have land to which to move in Minnesota too.

Mr. VINSON. The matter was approved by the Committee on Armed Services, and it is pending now in the other body. But the gentleman's proposition is not an analogous proposition

because he is proposing to close up today.

Mr. JUDD. No, no; in 18 months. This would give them 18 months to move elsewhere. That is what my amendment says.

Mr. VINSON. Very well, but the gentleman is proposing to close up right now, remove the base, without any provision made to accommodate that activity. Congress would not be acting wisely to do that. No doubt the base should be closed and others should be closed and located in other isolated places. But I trust the Committee will not vote for an amendment like that.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. May I say to my beloved chairman that he knows, as I do, that we have set a precedent here today. The bill originally had permissive language, but let us be honest about it, this is a precedent. And we are going to be sorry about it one of these days. Let me say that this was the first indication I had of it. I have heard repeatedly from various people to get these things out of here. But today we have set a precedent. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] says, these people are being killed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Houston proposition is not analogous to this at all. For 3 long years the San Jacinto matter was pending before the Committee on Armed Services. It was studied by the Department. Complete hearings were had. That was the justification for it. Here an amendment is offered to close up a going air base—just close it up. If Congress wants to do it, it has the authority to do it. It is up to the membership; they must make up their mind. If that is the type of legislative approach they want to give it, then they may go ahead and do it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this is largely a question of air traffic in that area. If they are going to put another jet base somewhere in the United States, I will be candid with my friend from Minnesota and say that we would be glad to invite them to come down to Louisiana. We would be glad to have them.

But it seems to me his problem is that of air control. The Committee on Interstate Commerce is now holding hearings on the question of sharing the air control between the military and the civilian. He can get the relief he wishes for his people and save the lives of both military and civilian personnel by cooperating with that committee and working out suitable rules for handling mutual traffic between military and civil aviation.

Mr. JUDD. The problem is not air control. It is due to trouble with the planes or the pilots in taking off or landing. In the worst case some kind

of engine failure occurred and the pilot trying to land could not make the runway and landed in the midst of a heavily populated area, not 15 miles away as in San Jacinto, but just across the street from the airport.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Perhaps it is a matter of air traffic. It is a pattern for use by that local base there. Perhaps the pattern they use in the takeoff and for coming in can be corrected and you can eliminate a great deal of the trouble you are suffering from now.

Mr. JUDD. This is a case where the Air Force and Naval Air themselves would like you to move away. They do not like it. But this bill contains only \$500,000 for the new base they need at Bethel; not \$44 million as is authorized for a new ammunition dump at Point aux Pins which the Army does not need and does not want.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize this is not the way to consider legislation; as the gentleman from Georgia has said, I do not intend to press for a vote on my amendment. I offered it only to underline the folly of the vote just taken on the San Jacinto project, and to give warning of what we are in for if we allow the vote to stand. I hope the vote will be reversed in the motion to recommit.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEWES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask several questions of the committee concerning line 5 of page 55 which refers specifically to housing installations at Truax Field in Madison.

There have been complaints that the activities of the Air Force in the acquisition of properties have been quite dictatorial. They have insisted, for instance, on appropriating 130 acres of excellent farmland when the owners have no desire to sell, and have rejected adjoining areas actually offered to them. This, I assure the committee, is the kind of activity which the taxpayer and citizen fails to understand.

Further, protests have been made to me that the housing is not even necessary.

I should like to have the chairman detail for the House the processes employed by the committee to determine the necessity for this housing.

Mr. VINSON. I will try to give the gentleman the information he desires concerning the requirements of housing in connection with the military installations.

First, the Department makes a most careful, detailed study. Then it must bring out plans for a Capehart house and must go to the FHA and have them approved. Then it comes back to the Department, and the Department comes to the committee. Then the committee has a subcommittee that sits down and hears witnesses, local witnesses from the community or witnesses from the serv-

ices or from any other place that is necessary. After we get all this information, finding out how many personnel there are in the installation eligible for quarters, the decision is reached as to whether or not we will build Capehart housing.

Mr. TEWES. Is it the position of the committee that the subcommittee has determined first of all the housing is necessary in the light of the housing which is presently available?

Mr. VINSON. We not only do that. I am glad the gentleman called attention to that. A complete survey is made of what the local community has contributed in the way of rental houses that are available for the Army personnel. Sometimes we find that a local community has adequate accommodations. Therefore, we disapprove of the Government going in and building any houses there. But, if the community does not have the facilities and if the Army, Navy, and the Air Force does not have the facilities, then we say under the law certain types of individuals in the service who are given quarters allowance will have the quarters allowance taken away from them and we will give them a house in which to live.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEWES. I yield.

Mr. BEAMER. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin raised a point that I attempted to raise with the gentleman from Louisiana only recently pertaining to a similar subject, the acquisition of real estate. I would like to reemphasize with all the emphasis that could be put upon it that the Committee on Armed Services should give considerable study and make it very emphatically known to the Armed Services and to the Department of Defense when they are dealing with the people who own the land that they wish to acquire for military installations, it should be taken by negotiation as much as possible and avoid the very expensive condemnation proceedings. I think that is vital. I hope the chairman will give consideration to that suggestion.

Mr. VINSON. I will state to the gentleman that that is the purpose of the committee, and it is the purpose of the three military departments to always try to negotiate for the sale of property, and only as a last resort to have condemnation proceedings.

Mr. BEAMER. If the gentleman would yield, I would like to state and tell the chairman that that has happened not once but many times. They have been purchasing land from farmers and they insist upon a set price and they will not budge one bit. As a result, farmers are losing from two to three hundred dollars per acre. These are absolutely cases that have happened in my district, and I think the gentleman from Wisconsin should be complimented for bringing it to the attention of the House.

Mr. VINSON. May I suggest to the gentleman that, perhaps, the cases to which the gentleman is referring are matters for which the local appraisers should be criticised?

Mr. BEAMER. Let me make a statement with reference to that. The appraisers were not local appraisers, but they were sent up from Chicago by the Navy or Air Force Department and local people did not even have a chance to say what the farmers' land was worth. I can give you several instances of such cases and I think it is very vital.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 11, strike out all of line 10 through line 22.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike out the provision for \$44,168,000 to build an ordnance depot at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala. Mr. Chairman, San Jacinto is a perfectly good ordnance depot which the Secretary of Defense has stated is not a health or safety hazard. Mr. Chairman, the Treasury of the United States is not a bottomless pit.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman that the theory and the reason why the \$44,168,000 was put in the bill was because it was estimated by Mr. Higgins that that would be the total cost of building an ammunition depot at Point Aux Pins. We had previously authorized \$26,951,000 for the construction of it. I am perfectly willing to see this figure stricken out and let it stand at \$26,951,000 because if you sell the 5,000 acres at Houston, Tex., they will then have sufficient money and probably within the \$26 million limit to build it, and there will be surplus money going to the Treasury of the United States from the sale at Houston.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the gentleman is accepting my amendment?

Mr. VINSON. I am accepting the gentleman's amendment. It strikes out the \$44,168,000. The balance of the section remains except the figure \$44,168,000; is that correct?

Mr. GROSS. My amendment strikes lines 10 through 22.

Mr. VINSON. That is perfectly all right also.

Mr. GROSS. That is fine.

Mr. VINSON. Because we have authorized \$26 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 67, strike out all of lines 9 through 18.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would, I hope, further nail down this proposition. This would again strike out reference to the appropriation of \$44,168,000.

Mr. VINSON. I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment because this still preserves the \$26 million originally appropriated.

Mr. GROSS. I am not so sure that it does. I hope that it strikes out every dime for this relocation and saves the taxpayers millions of dollars.

Mr. VINSON. If it does not it will be corrected at the proper place.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to determine the status of the proposed early warning and radar station at Sundance, Wyo.

This was first proposed by the Air Force in 1955. Since that time there has been substantial interest in that area with regard to it. The committee report on this bill does not specifically mention this new facility to be located in the State of Wyoming.

I have been in constant contact and have had voluminous correspondence with the Department of the Air Force concerning this ever since 1955. On July 3, 1958, I was advised in a letter from the Secretary of the Air Force as follows:

The facilities for the establishment of the Sundance site are presently included in the Air Force fiscal year 1959 military construction program, which is currently before the Congress.

I quote from Secretary Bryant's statement before the committee appearing at page 7057 of the committee hearings:

The utilization of new weapons and the assignment of new missions require that certain new bases be provided. A list of the new bases which are in this bill at unclassified locations is shown below.

And the first one he lists is the Sundance Air Force base at Sundance, Wyo., aircraft control and warning radar station.

In the committee report on page 79 there is further listed at various locations in the Zone of the Interior: "Air Force, \$163,629,000."

I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee if the Air Force base at Sundance has been included in this bill and funds provided for this base.

Mr. VINSON. I will state that the bill does include the Sundance Air Force Base. It is taken care of in the item of \$163 million. It is in there.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 617, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill H. R. 13015, to the House Committee on Armed Services, with instruction to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 16, insert section 110 as follows:

"Sec. 110. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to sell the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Tex., at not less than fair market value as determined by the Secretary of the Army and to convey by quitclaim deed all right, title, and interest, of the United States in and to said depot, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be in the public interest. Provided: That if such authority is exercised by the Secretary of the Army, it shall be subject to the following:

"A. The United States may retain possession of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot or any part thereof until such time as substitute facilities are substantially completed and available for use at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala.

"B. The San Jacinto Ordnance Depot property shall be advertised for sale by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on behalf of and under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army.

"C. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Army such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, including land acquisition, the sale relocation of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, and the establishment of a fully integrated depot at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala. The monetary limitation imposed by section 502 hereof shall not be inclusive of any funds required for or in connection with the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot relocation."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on the motion to recommit, with instructions, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings on this matter be put over until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to proceed for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority whip if he will kindly inform the Members of the House as to what will be taken up tomorrow and in what order.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the first order of business will be the vote on the motion to recommit H. R. 13015, the military-construction bill.

Next will be the vote on the passage under suspension of the rules of S. 495, followed by a vote on adoption of the rule to consider S. 1832, providing for an additional Assistant Secretary of State. If the rule is adopted, S. 1832 will then be considered in the Committee of the Whole.

The next order of business will be consideration of House Joint Resolution 424, crimes and offenses, sentencing procedure, and, if time permits after the consideration of that bill, it is planned to call up the bill, S. 1411, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, dealing with the suspension of employment of civilian personnel.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

(Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 111 on Friday, June 27, on the passage of the bill H. R. 12832, the Transportation Act of 1958, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present and voting I would have voted "yea."

ATOMIC REACTOR ELECTRIC POWER COST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 25 minutes:

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Sun on Monday put into correct focus the facts about the \$386 million atomic authorization bill reported July 1 by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

Mr. Rodney Crowther, the Sun reporter, told how the new authorization bill could socialize the atom as a source of energy.

I call special attention to the concluding paragraphs of Mr. Crowther's story:

What worries some of the critics from private industry is twofold: First, that the reactor program will run into multiple billions; and second, that the Government will insist on developing a socialized power industry no matter how much it costs.

AEC officials have told some of these critics that they are seeing gremlins where none are; and Members of Congress declare that it is a race against the Communist world and that the money must be spent, no matter how much it comes to.

If it were only a one-shot business and the first reactors built would produce electric

power at competitive prices, the private industries, it has been said, would jump at that chance to get into the business.

But, they appear troubled by reports from congressional sources that the Federal program will involve second and third generation large-scale reactors costing billions of dollars before anything approaching a competitive situation will occur.

Some of the critics point to the Shippingport reactor, built at a cost of around \$120 million and recently put into service.

COSTS COMPARED

The coal people charge, for example, that Shippingport has been erected right on top of coal beds where conventional methods can produce power for 5 mills per kilowatt-hour. But the Shippingport reactor power, they insist, will cost between 75 and 100 mills per kilowatt-hour.

The Shippingport power is being sold to the Duquesne Power & Light Co., they assert, for about 8 mills per kilowatt-hour and the Government absorbing the loss—estimated at \$25 million a year.

Perhaps the most disturbing facts reported by Mr. Crowther appear at the end of his story:

Some of the views of the private industry critics are due to be aired when the authorization bill comes before the Senate and House, but there is little likelihood that they will have any deterrent effect upon Members of Congress.

Their view is that for the long-range future their reactor program is a necessity and for the national security the weapon-material program must be pushed relentlessly.

Gentlemen, this is an objective report about a controversial activity. The Baltimore Sun recognizes that the climate today is unfavorable to private enterprise in the public utility business. While the astute Sun did not say so, apparently its reporter recognized that there has been a revolution in the minds of the members of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. Therefore, the Sun has concluded that Congress will not reject a bill unanimously reported by the members of that committee, and that it will without much inquiry put the stamp of its approval on what is obviously the biggest grab for economic as well as electric power in the history of our country.

I also wish to call particular attention to the second and third paragraphs of the Baltimore Sun article which read:

In boosting the bill well above what the administration recommended and outlining a long-range program for future development, the committee caused some eyebrows to rise in some segments of the private utility industry.

It also caused some apprehensions among producers of conventional fuels, such as coal, oil and gas, who see in the committee's announced proposals—and some unannounced ones which are scheduled to be reported to this session later—a plan to spend several billion dollars, or more, to launch the United States Government in the business of producing electric energy from atomic reactors.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the Sun atomic story be placed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

July 10, 1958

Congress to insure that a fair proportion of the total sales of Government property be made to small-business concerns; provides that those activities relating to the furnishing of technical and managerial aids to small-business concerns, consultation and cooperation by Small Business Adm. with Federal contracting officers, certification of small-business concerns as competent to perform Government contracts, the obtaining of contracting information from Federal agencies, the conduct of studies and the making of recommendations by SBA to Federal agencies, and the award of Government contracts to small-business concerns are expanded to cover small-business participation in purchases from the Government as well as in procurement by the Government; and provides that the new small-business set-aside program in Government sales will not affect or change any of the preferences or priorities established by law with respect to the sale of electrical power or any other property by the Government. pp. 12163-165

13. FORESTRY; HOG-CHOLERA. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment S. 3478, to insure the maintenance of an adequate supply of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-cholera virus (H. Rept. 2144), and H. R. 12704, to authorize the use of receipts from the national forests for general local government purposes as well as for public schools and public roads (H. Rept. 2139). p. 12226
14. PERSONNEL. Passed, 295 to 46, with amendments S. 1411, to give agencies discretion in either suspending or retaining on duty a Federal employee prior to security hearings. As passed, the bill provides that all Federal employees are deemed to be employed in an activity involving national security, that the head of any department or agency may, in his discretion, suspend an employee when he deems it necessary in the interest of national security, that the department or agency head is not required to suspend an employee prior to the final disposition of the case, that the employee is entitled to a written statement of the charges against him, an opportunity to answer the charges, a hearing at the employee's request, and a review and written decision by the department or agency head, and that the employee is entitled to appeal the decision to the Civil Service Commission whose decision will be final. pp. 12180-195
Rejected, 28 to 125, an amendment by Rep. Porter to provide that hearings conducted by agencies at the employee's request would be conducted in accordance with due process of law. pp. 12189-191
15. RECLAMATION. The "Daily Digest" states as follows: "Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Met Wednesday regarding H. R. 594, Fryingpan-Arkansas project, and rejected by vote of 22 to 2, with 4 not voting, a motion to postpone hearings until July 30. Also the committee rejected by vote of 21 to 3, with 3 voting present, a motion to postpone further consideration until the Department of the Interior reports on effect of recent Colorado district court decision regarding availability of water for the project." p. D661
16. PUBLIC WORKS. A subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee ordered adversely reported H. R. 9374, to require bonds for certain public works construction contracts. p. D661
17. APPROPRIATIONS. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 12948, the D. C. appropriation bill for 1959. Senate conferees have not yet been appointed. p. 12160
18. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Passed, 376 to 2, with amendments, H. R. 13015, to authorize construction at military installations, including authorization for financing military housing from the foreign currencies acquired under Public Law 480 or through other commodity transactions of CCC. pp. 12160-162

19. ORGANIZATION. Passed without amendment S. 1832, to provide an additional position as Assistant Secretary of State for African affairs. pp. 12166-169
20. TOBACCO. Rep. Blitch spoke in favor of the enactment of legislation to exempt the processing of cigar wrapper tobacco from the Fair Labor Standards Act. pp. 12196-197
21. WATERSHEDS. Received from the Budget Bureau plans for works of improvement pertaining to Dry Devils River and Lowrey Draw watershed and Upper Lake Fork Creek watershed, Tex.; to Public Works Committee. p. 12226
22. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced the following bills are scheduled for consideration next week: H. R. 3, effects of acts of Congress on State laws; H. R. 13121, atomic energy authorization bill; H. R. 4504, marketing facilities for perishable commodities; and S. 3651, the proposed Small Business Investment Act of 1958. He stated that bills to extend Public Law 480 and for area redevelopment have not been scheduled for consideration next week. He also stated that the Private Calendar will be called on Tues. pp. 12176-177
23. ADJOURNED until Mon., July 14. p. 12226

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

24. LANDS. Sen. Neuberger inserted two articles favoring S. 3051, the Klamath Indian land bill, and refuting the alleged opposition to this bill by the Nat'l Lumber Manufacturers Ass'n. pp. A6191-2
25. COOPERATIVES. Extension of remarks of Sen. Proxmire inserting an article, "Benson and the Cooperatives," and stating that it "called attention to the strange lack of enthusiasm evidenced by the Secretary of Agriculture for the interests of farmers and of their organizations." p. A6192
26. ONIONS. Sen. Wiley inserted a press release from his office favoring legislation to eliminate futures trading in onions. pp. A6196-7
27. SOIL CONSERVATION. Extension of remarks of Sen. Neuberger inserting Henry Pavelek's, SCS, Albany, Oreg., article detailing the essential importance of flood control to wise soil practices. p. A6197
28. FOREIGN TRADE. Extension of remarks of Sen. Carlson inserting an article, "Flour Manipulation by Haiti," criticizing the action of Haiti in raising import duty on flour. pp. A6198-9
29. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Kee inserted her newsletter describing the functions of the International Operations Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee and their examination of the administration of the foreign aid program. pp. A6203-4
30. FAMILY FARM. Sen. Proxmire commended and inserted a Nat'l Catholic Rural Life Conference statement which makes an appeal for the family farm and discusses the agricultural revolution for the past 25 years. pp. A6204-6
31. FOOD ADDITIVES. Rep. Dingell inserted a Western States Ass'n of Dairy, Food, and Drug Officials letter and resolution favoring proposed legislation relating to the protesting of chemicals intended to be used in foods. pp. A6215-6

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, JULY 10, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Glenn L. Utterback, minister, the Little Brown Church in the Valé, Nashua, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

O God Eternal, Thou who art wisdom and understanding, Thou who art creator of all the universes, kindle in us a clear vision of Thy holy will.

Give us diligence to seek knowledge and understanding; courage to use wisdom.

May these leaders of our great Nation keep paths of justice clean, and may right relationships be preserved among our fellow men, and among all nations.

When all kinds of trials and temptations crowd into our lives, let us not resent them as intruders, but welcome them as friends. May we realize, O God, that they test our faith, and produce in us a quality of endurance. Let this process continue that we become men of mature character with the right sort of independence.

Help us, O Lord, to discern that which is right, rather than design from selfish motives.

To Thy name we ascribe all praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

A communication from the President of the United States informed the House that on June 28, 1958, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10969. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 13130. An act to extend for 2 years the existing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury in respect of transfers of distilled spirits for purposes deemed necessary to meet the requirements of the national defense.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9147. An act to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Boulder City area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Nevada, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MURRAY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. KUCHEL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 12858. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. KERR, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. DWORSHAK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3557. An act to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended (64 Stat. 12).

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 692. An act to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Indians entitled to the use thereof the lands described in the Executive order of December 16, 1882, and for adjudicating the conflicting claims thereto of the Navaho and Hopi Indians, and for other purposes.

FREE ENTERPRISE IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

(Mrs. BLITCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to provide a new farm program for basic agricultural commodities under which excessive and burdensome Federal controls on agriculture will be eliminated, and under which American agriculture will be restored to a free-enterprise basis.

This bill was introduced in the Senate on April 23 by the Honorable HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia. I hope the Agriculture Committee will give the bill seri-

ous consideration for I sincerely believe it provides a basis upon which our badly divided farm Representatives can get together to solve the serious agriculture dilemma with which all farmers in the Nation are faced.

When the bill is fully explored, those Representatives who represent only the consumer of agricultural products will find that they, too, can give unqualified support to the measure, for the bill not only provides a program under which the farmer can farm, but it also allows agricultural products to reach their normal price range in the market place.

The bill has the important added attraction of costing the taxpayer less than any present farm program does, while at the same time the farmer will receive every dollar of the money to be authorized for appropriations under the act.

The bill is not complex but can be easily understood.

I invite the attention of every Member of the House to this bill because if enacted it will solve one of the most distressing problems with which the people of this Nation are faced.

RUSSIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Russia threatens to leave the U. N. So what. I am not sure Russia should have a choice. Perhaps the best course will be summarily to drop Russia from membership in that body.

Russia has done nothing to justify membership in a constructive, deliberative body of responsible nations. Her tactics throughout have been obstructionist in character; her aims destructive. She has used the United Nations as a sounding board to injure and undermine the free world. Not once has Russia appeared in a role of leadership for the good of humanity.

Without Russia, the U. N. could achieve many worthwhile objectives which that nation has blocked in the last decade.

Without Russia, the U. N. could become the force for good which its founders envisioned.

Without Russia, its members could achieve unity, create respect for its efforts, and gain recognition for its strength.

And what would Russia do outside the U. N.? Just exactly what she does in the U. N. But without a sounding board—and with a more closely knit opposition—her efforts would lose much of their present effectiveness.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
COMMITTEE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight Friday to file reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

(Mr. BENTLEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 27, and again on Monday, June 30, I was necessarily absent from the sessions of the Congress and, therefore, missed being recorded on rollcalls Nos. 109, 110, 111, and 112. I would like to announce that, had I been present, I would have voted against the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1958, in favor of recommitting the Mutual Security Act of 1958, in favor of the Transportation Act of 1958, and in favor of the extension of the special milk program for children.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 112 I was present and answered "aye." I am recorded as absent. I ask unanimous consent that the Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 12948) making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. RABAUT, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. WILSON of Indiana, and Mr. TABER.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tomorrow night to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 12948) making appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on page 12071, in the third column of the Record, the words

"farm houses" be corrected to "four houses."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record 2 timely editorials, 1 from the Savannah, Ga., Evening Press of June 4, 1958, and 1 from the Savannah, Ga., Morning News of June 5, 1958.

These editorials pay a just and deserving tribute to Hon. James A. Farley, former chairman of the Democratic National Committee and former Postmaster General, who is well and favorably known throughout the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING MILITARY
CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] to recommit the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk will again report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross moves to recommit the bill H. R. 13015, to the House Committee on Armed Services, with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 16, strike out all of section 10 and insert:

"SEC. 110. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to sell the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Tex., at not less than fair market value as determined by the Secretary of the Army and to convey by quitclaim deed all right, title, and interest, of the United States in and to said depot, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be in the public interest: *Provided*, That if such authority is exercised by the Secretary of the Army, it shall be subject to the following:

"A. The United States may retain possession of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot or any part thereof until such time as substitute facilities are substantially completed and available for use at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala.

"B. The San Jacinto Ordnance Depot property shall be advertised for sale by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on behalf of and under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army.

"C. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Army such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, including land acquisition, the sale relocation of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, and the establishment of a fully integrated depot at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala. The monetary limitation imposed by section 502 hereof shall not be inclusive of any funds required for or in connection with the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot relocation."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 202, answering "present" 2, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—179

Abbitt	Ford	Miller, N. Y.
Alexander	Frelinghuysen	Moore
Alger	Fulton	Morano
Allen, Calif.	Gavin	Mumma
Allen, Ill.	George	Neal
Andersen,	Glenn	Nicholson
H. Carl	Griffin	Nimtz
Ashley	Gross	Norblad
Auchincloss	Hale	O'Hara, Minn.
Avery	Haley	O'Konski
Ayres	Halleck	Ostertag
Baker	Harden	Pelly
Bass, N. H.	Harrison, Nebr.	Pillion
Bates	Harvey	Poff
Baumhart	Haskell	Prouty
Beamer	Henderson	Quie
Becker	Herlong	Ray
Belcher	Heseltun	Rces, Kans.
Bentley	Hess	Rhodes, Ariz.
Berry	Hiestand	Riehlman
Betts	Hill	Robison, N. Y.
Bolton	Hillings	Robison, Ky.
Bosch	Hoeven	Rogers, Fla.
Bray	Hoffman	Rogers, Mass.
Broomfield	Holmes	Sadlak
Brown, Ohio	Holt	St. George
Brownson	Horan	Saylor
Broyhill	Hosmer	Schenck
Budge	Hull	Scherer
Bush	Hyde	Schwengel
Byrne, Ill.	Jackson	Scott, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	James	Scudder
Canfield	Johansen	Seely-Brown
Cannon	Jonas	Sheehan
Carrigg	Jones, Mo.	Siler
Cederberg	Judd	Simpson, Ill.
Chamberlain	Kean	Simpson, Pa.
Chenoweth	Kearns	Smith, Calif.
Chiperfield	Keating	Smith, Kans.
Clevenger	Knox	Springer
Collier	Krueger	Stauffer
Corbett	Lafore	Taber
Coudert	Laird	Teague, Calif.
Cretella	LeCompte	Tewes
Cunningham,	Lipscomb	Thomson, Wyo.
Iowa	McCulloch	Tollefson
Cunningham,	McDonough	Utt
Nebr.	McGregor	Van Pelt
Curtin	McIntire	Van Zandt
Curits, Mass.	McIntosh	Vorys
Dague	McVey	Vursell
Dawson, Utah	Mack, Wash.	Wainwright
Dennison	Mailliard	Weaver
Derounian	Martin	Westland
Devereux	Mason	Wharton
Dixon	May	Widnall
Dorn, N. Y.	Meader	Wigglesworth
Dwyer	Morrow	Wilson, Ind.
Feighan	Michel	Withrow
Fenton	Miller, Md.	Younger
Fino	Miller, Nebr.	

NAYS—202

Abernethy	Coffin	Gordon
Addonizio	Colmer	Granahan
Albert	Davis, Ga.	Grant
Andrews	Davis, Tenn.	Gray
Ashmore	Dawson, Ill.	Green, Oreg.
Aspinall	Delaney	Green, Pa.
Bailey	Dellay	Griffiths
Baldwin	Dent	Gubser
Barden	Denton	Hagen
Barrett	Diggs	Hardy
Beckworth	Dingell	Harris
Bennett, Fla.	Dollinger	Harrison, Va.
Bennett, Mich.	Donohue	Hays, Ohio
Blatnik	Dorn, S. C.	Healey
Blitch	Doyle	Hébert
Boggs	Durham	Hemphill
Boland	Edmondson	Hollifield
Bolling	Elliot	Holland
Bonner	Engle	Holtzman
Boykin	Everett	Huddleston
Boyle	Evins	Ikard
Breeding	Fallon	Jarman
Brooks, La.	Fascell	Jennings
Brooks, Tex.	Fisher	Johnson
Brown, Ga.	Flood	Jones, Ala.
Brown, Mo.	Flynt	Karsten
Burleson	Fogarty	Kee
Byrd	Forand	Kelly, N. Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Forrester	Keogh
Carnahan	Fountain	Kilgore
Celler	Frazier	King
Chelf	Friedel	Kirwan
Church	Garmatz	Kitchin
Clark	Gary	Kluczynski
Coad	Gathings	Knutson

Lane
Lankford
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Loser
McCarthy
McCormack
McFall
McGovern
McMillan
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Matthews
Metcalfe
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Mitchell
Montoya
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murray
Natcher
Nix
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.

O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
Osmer
Patman
Patterson
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pillcher
Poage
Polk
Porter
Price
Rabaut
Rains
Reece, Tenn.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Santangelo
Saund
Scott, N. C.
Selden
Sheppard
Sleminski

Sikes
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Teller
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tuck
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Vinson
Walter
Watts
Whitener
Whitten
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, Calif.
Winstead
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

ANSWERING "PRESENT"—2

Bow Scrivner

NOT VOTING—47

Adair
Anderson,
Mont.
Anfuso
Arends
Baring
Bass, Tenn.
Buckley
Burdick
Christopher
Cooley
Cramer
Curtis, Mo.
Dies
Dooley
Dowdy

Eberharter
Farbstein
Gregory
Gwinn
Hays, Ark.
Jenkins
Jensen
Kearney
Kilburn
Kilday
Landrum
Latham
Minshall
Morris
Moulder
O'Brien, N. Y.

Passman
Powell
Preston
Radwan
Reed
Robeson, Va.
Shelley
Shuford
Talle
Taylor
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N. J.
Trimble
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wolverton

The motion to recommit was rejected.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Bow against.
Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Preston against.
Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Landrum against.
Mr. Cramer for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Minshall for, with Mr. Wolverton against.
Mr. Dooley for, with Mr. Hays of Arkansas against.
Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Anfuso against.
Mr. Jensen for, with Mr. Christopher against.
Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Dowdy against.
Mr. Radwan for, with Mr. Moulder against.
Mr. Williams of New York for, with Mr. Kilday against.
Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Farbstein against.
Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. Burdick for, with Mr. Baring against.
Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Shelley against.
Mr. Reed for, with Mr. O'Brien of New York against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Robeson of Virginia with Mr. Talle.

Mr. HEMPHILL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

No. 115—10

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.
Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 376, nays 2, answered "present" 1, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

YEAS—376

Abbt
Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Alger
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Andrews
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Barden
Barrett
Bass, N. H.
Bates
Baumhart
Beamer
Becker
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bonner
Bosch
Bow
Boykin
Boyle
Bray
Breeding
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Broomfield
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Mo.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Budge
Burlison
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Ill.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Cannon
Carnahan
Carrigg
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chipfield
Church
Clark
Clevenger
Coad
Coffin
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Coudert
Cretella
Cunningham,
Iowa
Cunningham,
Nebr.
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.

Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Delaney
Dellay
Dennison
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Devereux
Diggs
Dingell
Dixon
Dollinger
Donohue
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Doyle
Durham
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Felghan
Fenton
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
George
Glenn
Gordon
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagen
Hale
Haley
Halleck
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Haskell
Hays, Ohio
Healey
Hébert
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Heslton
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillings
Hoeven
Hoffman
Hollifield
Holland
Holmes
Holt
Holtzman
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hyde
Ikard

Jackson
James
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karsten
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilgore
King
Kirwan
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Knox
Knutson
Krueger
Lafore
Laird
Lane
Lankford
LeCompte
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lipscomb
Loser
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDonough
McFall
McGovern
McGregor
McIntire
McIntosh
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin
Mason
Matthews
May
Meador
Merrow
Metcalfe
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Mitchell
Montoya
Moore
Morano
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Mumma
Murray
Natcher
Neal
Nicholson
Nimtz
Nix
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Osmer
Ostertag

Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pillcher
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Polk
Porter
Price
Quile
Rabaut
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robison, N. Y.
Robison, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Sadlak

Santangelo
St. George
Saund
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott, N. C.
Scott, Pa.
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Sheppard
Sleminski
Sikes
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Stauffer
Steed
Sullivan
Taber
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Teller
Tewes
Thomas

Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Tuck
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Vorys
Wainwright
Walter
Watts
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Wildnall
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Withrow
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—2

Gross Marshall

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Scrivner

NOT VOTING—51

Adair
Anderson,
Mont.
Anfuso
Arends
Baring
Bass, Tenn.
Buckley
Burdick
Christopher
Cooley
Cramer
Curtis, Mo.
Dies
Dooley
Dowdy
Eberharter
Farbstein

Gregory
Gwinn
Hays, Ark.
Jenkins
Kearney
Kilburn
Kilday
Landrum
Latham
McCormack
Minshall
Morris
Moulder
O'Brien, N. Y.
Passman
Powell
Preston
Prouty

Radwan
Rains
Reed
Robeson, Va.
Shelley
Shuford
Talle
Taylor
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N. J.
Trimble
Vursell
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wolverton

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Anderson of Montana with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Robeson of Virginia with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Wolverton.
Mr. Moulder of Missouri with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Christopher with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Dooley.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Preston with Mr. Talle.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Vursell.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Williams of New York.
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Reed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, following the practice of several years since I became a member of the military subcommittee on appropriations, I have always responded "present" as I did today. Therefore, I wish to be recorded as having answered "present" and not "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY IN SQUARE 725, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill (S. 495) to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that in his opinion two-thirds had voted in the affirmative.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. Under the rules of the House, is it proper to count Members who are behind the railing?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has made the count and the Chair's count will not be disputed.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning the count. I am just asking whether it is proper and in order to count those behind the railing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In response to the gentleman's inquiry, the Chair may and the present occupant of the chair will always, when he is in the chair, count any Member who is visible and in the Chamber.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 232, nays 150, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—232

Addonizio	Bolling	Clevenger
Albert	Bolton	Coad
Allen, Calif.	Bonner	Coffin
Andersen,	Bow	Curtin
H. Carl	Boykin	Curtis, Mass.
Andrews	Boyle	Davis, Tenn.
Ashley	Breeding	Dawson, Ill.
Aspinall	Brooks, La.	Delaney
Auchincloss	Brooks, Tex.	Dellay
Avery	Brown, Ga.	Dent
Ayres	Brown, Mo.	Denton
Balley	Broyhill	Devereux
Baker	Burleson	Diggs
Barrett	Byrne, Pa.	Dingell
Bass, N. H.	Cannon	Dollinger
Bates	Carnahan	Donohue
Beckworth	Carrigg	Dorn, N. Y.
Bennett, Fla.	Celler	Doyle
Bennett, Mich.	Chamberlain	Durham
Blatnik	Chenoweth	Edmondson
Blitch	Clark	Elliott

Engle	Kee	Porter
Everett	Kelly, N. Y.	Price
Evins	Keogh	Prouty
Fallon	Killgore	Rabaut
Fascell	King	Rains
Felghan	Kirwan	Reece, Tenn.
Fisher	Kluczynski	Reuss
Flood	Knutson	Rhodes, Ariz.
Fogarty	Lane	Rhodes, Pa.
Forand	Lankford	Riehlman
Ford	Lesinski	Riley
Frazier	Libonati	Rivers
Friedel	McCarthy	Robison, N. Y.
Fulton	McCormack	Rodino
Garmatz	McDonough	Rogers, Colo.
Gary	McFall	Rogers, Fla.
Gathings	McGovern	Rogers, Mass.
Gavin	McGregor	Rooney
George	Machrowicz	Roosevelt
Glenn	Mack, Ill.	Rutherford
Gordon	Madden	Santangelo
Granahan	Magnuson	Saund
Gray	Mahon	Saylor
Green, Oreg.	Maillard	Scherer
Green, Pa.	Marshall	Scudder
Griffiths	Martin	Seiden
Gubser	Meador	Sheppard
Hagen	Merrrow	Sikes
Halleck	Metcalf	Sisk
Hardy	Michel	Smith, Kans.
Harris	Miller, Calif.	Smith, Miss.
Harvey	Miller, Md.	Spence
Haskell	Mills	Staggers
Hays, Ohio	Mitchell	Steed
Healey	Montoya	Sullivan
Hess	Morano	Teague, Tex.
Hillings	Morgan	Teller
Hollifield	Morrison	Thomas
Holland	Moss	Thompson, Tex.
Holmes	Multer	Thornberry
Holt	Murray	Udall
Holtzman	Natcher	Ullman
Horan	Nicholson	Van Zandt
Hosmer	Nix	Vinson
Huddleston	Norblad	Voris
Hull	Norrell	Wainwright
Hyde	O'Brien, Ill.	Walter
Ikard	O'Hara, Ill.	Westland
Jackson	O'Hara, Minn.	Whitten
Jarman	O'Neil	Widnall
Jennings	Osmer	Wigglesworth
Jones, Ala.	Patman	Wright
Jones, Mo.	Pfost	Yates
Judd	Philbin	Young
Karsten	Pilcher	Zablocki
Kean	Poage	Zelenko
Kearns	Polk	

NAYS—150

Abbitt	Derounian	McVey
Abernethy	Dixon	Macdonald
Alexander	Dorn, S. C.	Mack, Wash.
Alger	Dwyer	Mason
Allen, Ill.	Fenton	Matthews
Ashmore	Fino	May
Baldwin	Flynt	Miller, Nebr.
Barden	Forrester	Miller, N. Y.
Baymhart	Fountain	Moore
Beamer	Frelinghuysen	Mumma
Becker	Grant	Neal
Belcher	Griffin	Nimtz
Bentley	Gross	O'Konski
Berry	Hale	Ostertag
Betts	Haley	Patterson
Boggs	Harden	Pelly
Boland	Harrison, Nebr.	Perkins
Bosch	Harrison, Va.	Pillion
Bray	Hemphill	Poff
Broomfield	Henderson	Quile
Brown, Ohio	Herlong	Ray
Brownson	Heseltun	Rees, Kans.
Budge	Hiestand	Roberts
Bush	Hill	Robison, Ky.
Byrd	Hoeven	Rogers, Tex.
Byrne, Ill.	Hoffman	Sadlak
Byrnes, Wis.	James	St. George
Canfield	Jensen	Schenck
Cederberg	Johansen	Schwengel
Chelf	Johnson	Scott, N. C.
Chiperfield	Jonas	Scott, Pa.
Church	Keating	Scrivner
Collier	Kitohin	Seely-Brown
Colmer	Knox	Sheehan
Corbett	Krueger	Siler
Coudert	Lafore	Simpson, Ill.
Cretella	Laird	Smith, Calif.
Cunningham,	LeCompte	Smith, Va.
Iowa	Lennon	Springer
Cunningham,	Lipscomb	Stauffer
Nebr.	Loser	Taber
Dague	McCulloch	Taylor
Davis, Ga.	McIntire	Teague, Calif.
Dawson, Utah	McIntosh	Tewes
Dennison	McMillan	Thomson, Wyo.

Tollefson
Tuck
Utt
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vursell

Watts
Weaver
Wharton
Whitener
Wier
Williams, Miss.

Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Withrow
Younger

NOT VOTING—48

Adair
Anderson,
Mont.
Anfuso
Arends
Baring
Bass, Tenn.
Buckley
Burdick
Christopher
Cooley
Cramer
Curtis, Mo.
Dies
Dooley
Dowdy
Eberharter

Farbstein
Gregory
Gwinn
Hays, Ark.
Hébert
Jenkins
Kearney
Kilburn
Kilday
Landrum
Latham
Minshall
Morris
Moulder
O'Brien, N. Y.
Passman
Powell

Preston
Radwan
Reed
Robeson, Va.
Shelley
Shuford
Sieminski
Simpson, Pa.
Talle
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N. J.
Trimble
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wolverton

So two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Anfuso and Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Arends against.

Mr. Anderson of Montana and Mr. Farbstein for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Mr. Hays or Arkansas and Mr. Trimble for, with Mr. Robeson of Virginia against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey and Mr. Moulder for, with Mr. Jenkins against.

Mr. Dooley and Mr. Christopher for, with Mr. Gwinn against.

Mr. Hébert and Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Talle against.

Mr. Wolverton and Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Radwan against.

Mr. Baring and Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Williams of New York against.

Mr. O'Brien of New York and Mr. Sieminski for, with Mr. Burdick against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Preston with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.

Mr. Kilday with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Reed.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Bass of Tennessee with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. BROOMFIELD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CORRECTION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, July 8, 1958, daily copy, page 11946, the statement was made by me that at one time a telephone operator in one of the Washington hotels was reporting conversations held with the then Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, to Drew Pearson. At that time, it was stated that I was speaking only from memory and that, if wrong, I would make a correction.

Subsequently inquiry has disclosed that, while an operator at one of the hotels was listening in and reporting on Hull's conversation, the report was made, not to Drew Pearson, but to a New York publication.

Permit me to apologize to Drew, and to express extreme gratification to learn that as to at least one disreputable act he was not a participant.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 25, 1958
For actions of July 24, 1958
85th-2d, No. 125

CONTENTS

Agricultural commodities.....	12		
AMS.....	2		
Appropriations...1,2,11,32			
ARS.....	2		
CCC.....	37		
Chemical additives.....	17		
Claims.....	6		
Contracts.....	2		
Cotton.....	1	Legislative program.....	19
Depressed areas.....	25	Library.....	2
Desert-land entries.....	16	Loans.....2,9	
Disaster loans.....	2	Marketing facilities.....	9
Education.....	33	Military construction.3,37	
Electrification.....	36	Minerals.....	13
Fair trade.....	35	Personnel.....14,34	
Farm program.....1,24		Property.....	29
Fisheries.....	22	Public Law 480.....2,37	
Flag.....	27	Publications.....	2
Foreign aid.....	20	REA.....	10
Forestry.....2,8,21		Reclamation.....	28
Housing.....	15	Recreation.....	2
		Research.....	2
		School lunch.....	18
		Seed.....	31
		Small business.....	7
		Statehood.....	26
		Surplus food.....	23
		Translations.....	2
		Transportation.....	12
		Water.....	2,4
		Watersheds.....	5
		Wheat.....	31
		Wildlife.....	30
		Wool.....	1

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated farm bill. Rep. Cannon criticized administration's farm program. Rep. Christopher urged REA be made independent agency. House rejected rule to consider bill to develop marketing facilities for perishable commodities.

SENATE

1. FARM PROGRAM. Continued debate on S. 4071, the farm bill. pp. 13645-65, 13666-71, 13673-703, 13705-33

Agreed, 67 to 9, to an amendment by Sen. Young to extend the National Wool Act for 4 years, until March 31, 1963, and to authorize such additional appropriations as may be necessary for carrying out the wool program, provided no price support payments for wool (beginning with the 1959 marketing year) shall exceed 85 percent of parity if the Secretary determines that payments to producers would exceed 70 percent of gross receipts of the specific import duties on wool. p. 13731

Rejected an amendment by Sen. Bennett, as an amendment to the amendment by Sen. Young, which would have authorized the Secretary to enter into agreements with wool organizations for the purpose of developing and conducting advertising and sales promotion programs for wool, mohair, sheep, or goats or the products thereof. pp. 13655, 13726

Pending at adjournment was an amendment by Sen. Symington to provide that the level of price support for upland cotton may be not less than 65 percent of parity, if the Secretary determines under certain conditions that a lower level than

Senate July 24, 1958

is provided under present law is desirable and proper, to provide that middling 1 inch and grade number 3, one and seven-sixteenths inches shall be the standard quality of upland and extra long staple cotton, respectively, for purposes of price support, and to strike out a provision of the bill providing that CCC shall not sell any upland or extra long staple cotton for unrestricted use at less than 15 percent above the current support price for cotton plus reasonable carrying charges. pp. 13731-32

2. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 12738, the Defense Department appropriation bill for 1959 (S. Rept. 1937). pp. 13626, D730

Received (July 22) from the President various proposed supplemental items, including the following: (S. Doc. 110)

Authorization for use of the equivalent of \$5,100,000, in foreign currencies accruing under Public Law 480, for the following purposes: \$1,200,000 for translation of foreign publications, of which \$375,000 is to be available to the USDA Library; and \$3,900,000 for cooperative scientific research between the U. S. and other countries through ARS, AMS, and FS.

Appropriation of \$100,000 for immediate costs of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, pending organization and staffing of the Commission.

Authorization for the Virgin Islands Corporation to borrow not over \$1,500,000 for construction of a water distillation plant.

Appropriation of \$215,000,000 for the business and disaster loan programs of the Small Business Administration, and additional funds to finance SBA's assistance of small business in obtaining Government contracts and sub-contracts.

3. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. The Armed Services Committee ordered reported with an amendment in the nature of a substitute bill H. R. 13015, authorizations for military construction. p. D730

4. WATER. The Public Works Committee reported with amendment H. R. 6701, to grant the consent of Congress to the Tennessee River Basin Water Pollution Control Compact (S. Rept. 1961). p. 13734

Agreed to S. Res. 328, to provide for the printing of additional copies of the report, "Water Developments and Potentialities." p. 13629

Sen. Kuchel commended the city of Coalinga, Calif., for authorizing the construction of a plant for the conversion of saline water for public use. p. 13632

5. WATERSHEDS. Both Houses received from the Budget Bureau plans for works of improvement on Adobe Creek, Buena Vista Creek, Central Sonoma, Calif., upper Nanticoke River, Del., Donaldson Creek, Ky., Mud Creek, Nebr., Peavine Mountain, Nev., Indian Creek, Tenn. and Miss., and Coon Creek, Wis.; to Agriculture Committees. pp. 13625, 13623.

6. CLAIMS. Received from this Department a report on tort claims paid by the Department in the fiscal year 1958. p. 13625

7. SMALL BUSINESS. Sen. Humphrey commended the Congress for passing legislation for the relief of small business. p. 13636

8. FORESTRY. Sen. Morse inserted a letter and newspaper editorial praising the enactment of legislation for the establishment of an Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. pp. 13733-34

85TH CONGRESS }
2d Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT
{ No. 1982

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION
FISCAL YEAR 1959

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

ON

H. R. 13015

AN ACT TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION FOR
THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE MILITARY
DEPARTMENTS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES



JULY 28, 1958.—Ordered to be printed

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1958

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia, *Chairman*

HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Virginia	LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Massachusetts
LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Texas	STYLES BRIDGES, New Hampshire
ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee	RALPH E. FLANDERS, Vermont
JOHN STENNIS, Mississippi	MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Maine
STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri	FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota
HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington	PRESCOTT BUSH, Connecticut
SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., North Carolina	FRANK A. BARRETT, Wyoming

HARRY L. WINGATE, Jr., *Chief Clerk*

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION SUBCOMMITTEE

JOHN STENNIS, Mississippi, *Chairman*

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington	FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota
------------------------------	----------------------------

KENNETH E. BELIEU, *Professional Staff Member*

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Purpose.....	1
Review procedure:	
Committee actions.....	4
Criteria.....	5
Concern.....	9
Conclusions, general.....	10
Defense actions.....	6
Objectives.....	7
Military policy, United States.....	10
Warning concept.....	10
DEW line.....	11
Aircraft control and warning.....	13
Ballistic missile detection.....	13
Costs.....	10, 12, 13
Retaliation concept.....	14
SAC.....	14, 16
Ballistic missiles.....	16, 17
Costs.....	14, 16
Defense concept.....	17
SAGE.....	18
Interceptors.....	18
BOMARC.....	18
NIKE-AJAX.....	19
NIKE-HERCULES.....	19
HAWK.....	20
ZEUS.....	20
Duplication of air defense systems.....	21
TALOS.....	21
NIKE.....	20, 22
BOMARC.....	22
Committee action.....	26, 27, 29
Defense versus offense.....	24
Costs.....	23
Limited war concept.....	29
Army, STRAC.....	30
Airlift.....	30
Marines.....	30
Housing, military, family.....	31
Requirements.....	31
Troop strengths.....	32, 33
Methods of providing.....	34
Community support.....	34
MCA.....	34
Surplus commodity.....	35, 39, 93
Capehart (title VIII).....	39, 93
Comparative costs.....	40, 42, 43
Wherry.....	45, 93
Substandard.....	47, 94
Overseas bases.....	47
Personnel.....	47, 48
Costs.....	48
Conclusions.....	50
Real estate.....	50
Air space, Washington.....	52
Competitive bids.....	55, 91
Hospitals and dependent medical care.....	56

	Page
Review procedure—Continued	
San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Tex.....	59
Reserve components.....	58, 94
Background.....	95
Navy and Marines.....	97
Army Reserve and National Guard.....	99
Air Reserves.....	98
Bill by titles:	
Army (title I).....	61
Navy (title II).....	66
Air Force (title III).....	75
Defense (title IV).....	88
General provisions (title V).....	89
Section 501.....	89
Sections 502 and 503.....	90
Sections 504, 505, 506.....	91
Sections 507, 508, 509, 510, 511.....	92
Sections 512, 513, 514.....	93
Sections 515, 516.....	94
Reserve components (title VI).....	94
Departmental data.....	100
State summary.....	102

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

JULY 28, 1958.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted
the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. R. 13015]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction for the Department of Defense and the military departments, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide the Department of Defense and the military departments with authorizations to construct facilities both in the United States and at certain overseas locations in the total amount of \$2,599,562,000.

The authorizations include: New authorizations in the amount of \$1,644,641,000, additions to prior year authorizations totaling \$64,455,000; authorizations to construct 30,000 title VIII family housing units with an estimated end cost to the Government of approximately \$833,220,000;¹ and authorizations to construct Reserve and National Guard facilities in the amount of \$57,246,000.

¹ While such housing is not considered a budget item, nevertheless the units must be paid for and this bill cannot properly be evaluated unless the housing costs are also considered—for once approved and made part of law—they present a charge against the taxpayer, a charge that is legitimate as any outright authorization and appropriation (see section on military family housing later in this report).

By title, the authorizations (excluding housing) are as follows:

Title I (Army):

New authorizations:

Inside continental United States.....	\$104,325,000
Outside continental United States.....	8,732,000
Classified.....	63,906,000
Emergency construction.....	25,000,000

Subtotal (new).....	201,963,000
Additions to prior authorizations.....	30,847,000

Army, grand total.....	232,810,000
------------------------	-------------

Title II (Navy):

New authorizations:

Inside continental United States.....	216,309,000
Outside continental United States.....	16,384,000
Classified.....	66,194,000
Emergency construction.....	25,000,000

Subtotal (new).....	323,887,000
Additions to prior authorizations.....	15,825,000

Navy, grand total.....	339,712,000
------------------------	-------------

Title III (Air Force):

New authorizations:

Inside continental United States.....	541,236,000
Outside continental United States.....	123,654,000
Classified.....	195,500,000
Emergency construction.....	25,000,000

Subtotal (new).....	885,390,000
Additions to prior authorizations.....	17,783,000

Air Force, grand total.....	903,173,000
-----------------------------	-------------

Title IV (Department of Defense):

Advanced Research Projects Agency.....	50,000,000
Missile systems.....	183,401,000

Department of Defense, grand total.....	233,401,000
---	-------------

Title V (general provisions): Housing (contingent liability)..... 833,220,000

Title VI (Reserve facilities):

Army:

National Guard.....	23,298,000
Reserve.....	5,032,000

Total, Army.....	28,330,000
------------------	------------

Naval and Marine Reserves.....	11,886,000
--------------------------------	------------

Air Force:

National Guard.....	11,976,000
Reserves.....	5,054,000

Total, Air Force.....	17,030,000
-----------------------	------------

Subtotal, Reserves and National Guard.....	57,246,000
--	------------

Grand total, bill.....	2,599,562,000
------------------------	---------------

FORM OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The bill on which the committee has held its hearings is S. 3756. The companion bill as passed by the House is H. R. 13015. Subsequent to the passage of H. R. 13015 by the House, certain additional amendments were approved by the Bureau of the Budget and requested by Department of Defense. These changes, together with those recommended by the committee, made it desirable to report a clean bill instead of adding the required number of amendments to the House-passed bill.

COMMITTEE REVIEW PROCEDURE

For the past 5 fiscal years the annual military construction authorization program has averaged approximately \$2 billion, annually. The actual authorizations approved by Congress for each year is shown below (these figures exclude title VIII family housing):

[In millions]

	Fiscal year 1953	Fiscal year 1954	Fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958	Total
Army-----	\$250	\$134	\$314	\$546	\$334	\$293	\$1,871
Navy-----	228	87	224	576	451	338	1,904
Air Force-----	1,514	189	982	1,393	1,530	1,152	6,760
Total-----	1,992	410	1,520	2,515	2,315	1,783	10,535

A more detailed summation follows:

Summary of military construction program ¹

[In millions]

	Fiscal year 1953	Fiscal year 1954	Fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Army annual authorization ² -----	\$250	\$134	\$314	\$546	\$334	\$293
Army annual appropriation-----	586	0	0	485	202	310
Army annual obligation-----	351	343	387	450	351	³ 63
Army annual expenditure-----	513	361	345	383	413	³ 224
Army unobligated balance at end of fiscal year-----	994	651	264	300	161	³ 419
Navy annual authorization ² -----	228	87	224	576	451	338
Navy annual appropriation-----	363	0	98	443	400	265
Navy annual obligation-----	403	204	217	418	408	³ 88
Navy annual expenditure-----	470	352	220	246	354	230
Navy unobligated balance at end of fiscal year-----	476	272	154	178	178	³ 390
Air Force annual authorization ² -----	1,514	189	982	1,393	1,530	1,152
Air Force annual appropriation-----	1,200	241	630	994	1,198	1,420
Air Force annual obligation-----	1,200	803	1,373	1,127	1,182	³ 164
Air Force annual expenditure-----	999	917	1,016	1,313	1,083	³ 606
Air Force unobligated balance at end of fiscal year-----	1,770	1,207	473	342	367	³ 1,623

¹ Excluding Reserve Forces, except for Air Force appropriations, obligations and expenditures.

² Including rescissions and amendments by later public laws.

³ As of Jan. 31, 1958.

⁴ Adjusted to include anticipated reimbursements.

Source: Prepared by OASD (Properties and Installations, Mar. 12, 1958).

If the amount of \$1,709,173,000 (excluding title VIII family housing) contained in this fiscal year 1959 bill is added, the 6-year total will be \$12,244,173,000. If the estimated cost to the Government of all title VIII housing including those authorized in this bill, totaling approximately \$3,400,000,000, are added, the grant total for fiscal year 1953 through fiscal year 1959 will be approximately \$15,644,173,000.

While \$15 billion is a very large sum, it does not represent a complete picture. The above tabulation viewed simply as data presents accurately enough the dry, unimaginative construction costs. Behind these figures, however, stand the major policy decisions upon which our country's defenses rest; and when the personnel, maintenance and operation, and equipment costs are added, the order of magnitude of our Nation's defensive effort begins to appear in true perspective.

In 1954 the Spanish bases started. In 1956, the first ICBM base was approved by Congress. Now the Spanish bases are nearly completed. The chronology of the military construction program since 1953 is also a history of the evolution—even revolution—that has taken place in the field of military science and tactics in this nuclear, jet, rocket, satellite age.

This year in its review of the fiscal year 1959 construction bill, the committee placed greater emphasis on the major policy areas which create the forces that require the facilities. This does not mean that full consideration was not given to each specific line item contained in the several hundreds of pages of justification books. The unclassified published record of the hearings is available. It is indexed by major subject and installation. Where security considerations permit, full details are shown. However, based on past experience, it has become obvious to this committee that the very act of authorizing the establishment of bases from which military operations may be conducted cannot be divorced from the broader field of policy. The committee has become well familiar with the routine and repetitive line items that go to make up the far greater majority of the 3,000 or 4,000 such items normally found in this type legislation. In addition, the committee has been pleased to note that during the past years more than 90 percent of all construction contracts have been let on competitive bid basis which means that if the principle of constructing a military facility to support a military operational requirement at a given location is agreed upon, the cost to the Government will normally be based on the lowest bid obtainable.

With this in mind, the committee as stated before, emphasized this year the major and special policy areas involved rather than a detailed review of the line items only. The committee wishes to emphasize again that past experience indicates that the committees of Congress cannot avoid making policy decisions when they consider and report this type of legislation.

With regard to these major policy areas, prior to starting the hearings, the committee worked out a schedule with Department of Defense and each service, indicating the subjects to be covered, typical were the ballistic missile programs, antisubmarine warfare requirements, and continental air defense weapons systems.

CRITERIA

As has been the practice in previous years, a standard criteria was established in light of which all services' requests were compared. A general outline of this criteria is as follows:

1. Line items to be considered firm requirements:

(a) All operational aspects properly justified and for which the services plan to request fiscal year 1959 appropriations.

(b) Replacement of inadequate or substandard facilities considered essential to morale and well-being, including chapels, service clubs, and the like.

(c) Community and recreational facilities and housing at isolated installations, or where local civilian community support does not exist within a reasonable distance or comparable cost.

(d) Key service-school installations for which the services have a long peacetime need.

(e) Deficiency authorizations pertaining to prior authorized projects resultant from cost-of living increases, from changes in military technology, and new operational concepts.

(f) Family housing units where the Secretary of Defense has certified that the number of units to be constructed are consistent with the requirements of the long-range troop basis, and that the number to be constructed when added to existing assets, will not result in greater than 55 percent of requirements.

2. Items considered feasible to delete or defer:

(a) Community-type items where adequate facilities already exist, suitable facilities are available, or local civilian community can provide similar support within a reasonable distance.

(b) Replacement of existing adequate administration buildings, hospitals, warehouses, and headquarters building.

(c) Replacement of temporary barracks and bachelor officers quarters where 70 percent of permanent requirement is met by permanent facilities already provided, or under construction.

(d) Family housing where there exists adequate civilian community support at a reasonable distance and at comparable cost; or sufficient prior authorization; or where construction of additional units would provide more than 55 percent of the permanent maximum requirement.

(e) All items not being funded.

(f) All items of permanent construction at installations which services cannot certify as consistent with long range requirements or troop basis.

3. Items considered feasible to add:

(a) Urgent operational facilities which the services had justified in previous years but which were not included in the fiscal year 1959 program for purely fiscal purposes.

(b) Operational and supporting facilities essential to meet the requirements of predicted operational dates of new weapons systems currently being developed and produced.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REVIEW PROCEDURE

As in preceding years, the form of action within Department of Defense in reviewing the fiscal year 1959 military construction authorization bill prior to its submission to Congress, followed the established pattern and procedure which are now so familiar to this committee—a procedure which has considerably improved with each successive year. Each year the committee has complimented the Office, Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), and this year is no exception. Without the knowledge that each fiscal year construction bill is so reviewed and supervised, the committee's job would be much more difficult.

The development of an annual construction program has its genesis, at least one year preceding its presentation to Congress in the form of proposed legislation. As of now, the fiscal year 1960 program is beginning to take concrete shape within the Department of Defense. Each service reviews the requests submitted from the field and following their approval at the Washington level, submits the services package to the Office, Secretary of Defense where the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) coordinates and combines each item into an overall defense package. Next, the unified program is forwarded to the Bureau of the Budget, thence back to the Department of Defense where the Bureau's actions (normally reductions) are reexamined and either accepted or reclama submitted. Then it finally reaches Congress.

Often this review is repeated several times before the construction program becomes proposed legislation. Last year, if the committee is correctly informed, approximately seven review cycles were completed before finalization. This year is no exception because the bill was received once again much later in the session than had been anticipated.

The committee cannot help but feel that the annual construction program should be submitted to Congress early in the session in order that it may receive the consideration it merits.

Secretary of Defense McElroy, in responding along this line before the House Appropriations Committee, replied:

I think what we have got to say in answer to the question is that we are not doing very well on that one and we had better get at it; that is not a good answer, but nevertheless. * * *

The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), Hon. Floyd S. Bryant, had the following to state regarding the review of the bill:

I wish to assure the committee that each project in this bill was individually and specifically reviewed and screened, in order to assure that the facilities being requested were strictly limited only to those definitely required to properly support the missions assigned to our military forces.

During the examination of this program in my office, and in the other offices of the Secretary of Defense, particular care was taken to verify that those projects selected for inclusion in this bill were needed to support long-term future objectives, military plans, and force levels.

We are well aware that heavy expenditures for new weapons will create a tremendous financial burden for the next several years. For this reason, the items requested in this bill have been strictly limited to those for which a compelling military necessity exists. Projects which were merely desirable, but not essential, have been eliminated. Moreover, those projects which were approved for inclusion in this bill were each scrutinized from the standpoint of size, cost, location, and proper designs. Uniform space and design criteria were applied throughout the three Departments.

Questionable projects were discussed in detail with the respective service representatives, and this year, as a result of our review and screening procedures, the programs submitted by all of the Departments were reduced from their original total of \$2,248 million, to an approved total of \$1,694,160,000. Then, the Bureau of the Budget conducted a still further review, during which the program was further reduced to \$1,684,361,000, which is the amount now before your committee. We feel that this is the minimum amount needed to satisfactorily support the missions assigned to our military forces.

He had the following to say with regard to the objectives of the bill as presented to Congress.

The construction projects comprising this bill total \$1,684,361,000, of which \$347,028,000 is for the Army; \$301,062,000 for the Navy; \$986,271,000 for the Air Force; and \$50 million for the Department of Defense. All of the items for which construction authorization is requested are in support of our retaliatory and defensive forces, and the major portion is in support of new programs which are part of the scientific and technical advances that are rapidly being made in our weapons systems. For example, \$545 million in this bill, or 32 percent, is directly in support of our missile programs, and their associated nuclear capability; approximately \$230 million, or 14 percent, is requested for expanded radar defense systems; \$208 million, or 12 percent, is for improving the capabilities of the Strategic Air Command; and \$178 million, or 11 percent, is for research and development, for antimissile missiles, and for the facilities covered by title IV which are required to support outer space projects. Substantial amounts are also included in support of submarine and antisubmarine activities, fighter aircraft programs, and combat training.

Status of military construction authorizations.—In order that the committee may review the status of all military construction authorization through fiscal years 1948 to date, the following summary is provided:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION

[In millions]

	Army	Navy	Air Force	Total
Total authorizations fiscal year 1948 through fiscal year 1958.....	\$4,401	\$3,734	\$12,168	\$20,303
Less unfunded authorizations repealed and rescinded through fiscal year 1957.....	-629	-324	-1,119	-2,072
Less estimated unfunded authorization to be repealed by sec. 506 of Public Law 85-241.....	-51	-17	-164	-232
Less appropriations fiscal year 1948 through fiscal year 1958.....	-3,358	-3,012	-9,617	-15,987
Less dollar equivalent of counterpart fund pesetas utilized through fiscal year 1958.....	0	-26	-53	-79
Residual authorization to be available at end fiscal year 1958.....	363	355	1,215	1,933
Additional new authorization proposed by fiscal year 1959 bill.....	+347	+301	+986	+1,634
Increases in prior year's authorization proposed by fiscal year 1959 bill.....	+14	+16	+18	+48
Total of fiscal year 1958 residual and proposed fiscal year 1959 authorizations.....	724	672	2,219	3,615
Less unfunded authorization to be repealed by sec. 507 of fiscal year 1959 bill.....	-168	-73	-787	-1,028
Less proposed fiscal year 1959 appropriation.....	-341	-360	-992	-1,693
Less counterpart fund pesetas proposed for utilization in fiscal year 1959.....	0	-15	-25	-40
Residual authorization to be available at end of fiscal year 1959.....	215	224	415	854

This tabulation illustrates that the amount of residual authorization available to the three military departments is being steadily reduced each fiscal year. This means that each year the lowest priority projects are eliminated through the annual rescission of unfunded authorization, as provided under section 507 of this bill. Consequently, the balance of residual authorization left available consists of both urgently needed projects, and other projects for which the requirement has changed due to revisions in missions and weapons. The military departments are each using part of their annual construction appropriations to assure continued progress on the most urgent of these residual projects. The remainder of their annual appropriation is applied to essential new project authorizations. It is necessary that a proper balance and control be maintained between these two segments of the program, so that construction can satisfactorily proceed on both residual and new authorization, at a rate which is in proper relationship to the funds the Defense Department can make available for military construction. In order to achieve this, the amount of new project authorization requested this year has been closely limited. It is intended to fund and utilize all of this new authorization during fiscal year 1959.

As indicated before, the committee compliments the personnel of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) as well as those of the three departments in their actions in formulating this year's construction program. The proposed legislation as presented to the committee represents one of the best thought out programs received. It is quite apparent that standard procedures have been applied which in themselves make for better unification,

and that by far the greater percentage of the requests are on a reasonable and austere basis. They represent primarily operational and supporting items essential to the better functioning of the Defense Establishment.

If the bill as presented had not involved certain underlying policy matters, it would have been almost possible for the committee to recommend approval of the proposed bill with very few changes.

AREAS OF COMMITTEE CONCERN

As previously stated, the committee, while thoroughly reviewing the many line items, directed its primary attention to the major defense policy areas. As a result, some of the conclusions cause a definite impact on certain areas—which, had they been considered in the light of simple construction criteria alone, would have occasioned little or no concern.

While the purely technical review procedures developed by Defense have improved in a most satisfactory manner, there remains one area of transcending importance where adequate coordination (or even decisions) is apparently lacking. This situation caused to be suspect some of the construction items in the bill which, if viewed unilaterally, would normally seem sound.

The committee refers to the need for a coordinated and concurrent development of the construction program in the light of approved national policies and in support of approved and unified long-range military plans, force levels, and objectives required by the approved national policies—this in order to insure that—

(a) True operational requirements are given priority over marginal ones.

(b) Locations selected for key strategic installations are consistent with operational needs, vulnerability studies, and not on purely fiscal ones.

(c) Facilities for new weapons systems are constructed in time to meet the planned operational and deployment dates of these new weapons.

(d) Decisions are made between duplicating weapons systems prior to the request that duplicating facilities be constructed.

(e) Additional facilities are not constructed for antiquated weapons systems or soon to be outdated ones (when proper coordination with long-range planning in light of new developments would eliminate such).

(f) Housing and other personnel facilities are constructed on the most economical basis, and in direct relation to the requirements of known and approved long-range troop basis.

(g) Fiscal decisions alone are not allowed to determine military capabilities once the military program has been approved in light of approved national policy.

(h) Facilities are constructed at overseas bases on an austere basis to meet operational requirements only, and in full consideration of the realities of the international political and diplomatic climate.

(i) Continuous supervision by qualified personnel of military construction projects to insure adherence to the principles of competitive bid and minimum cost to the Government.

(j) Full consideration is given to the possible impact of the military construction program on our Nation's economy both now and in the future.

FINAL COMMITTEE ACTION

As a result of its deliberations, the bill as reported by the committee differs in major dollar areas from that originally presented, as indicated below. (The specific reasons and recommendations are covered in more detail in subsequent paragraphs.)

Authorizations	Original	Committee action	Difference
Active Forces:			
Army-----	\$377,875,000	\$232,810,000	-\$145,065,000
Navy-----	316,887,000	339,712,000	+22,825,000
Air Force-----	1,004,054,000	903,173,000	-100,881,000
Office, Secretary of Defense-----	50,000,000	233,401,000	+183,401,000
Total-----	1,748,816,000	1,709,096,000	-39,720,000
Housing (title VIII):			
Total (units)-----	50,000	30,000	-----
Total contingent liability-----	1,388,700,000	833,220,000	-555,480,000
Reserve forces:			
National Guard:			
Army-----	0	23,298,000	+23,298,000
Air Force-----	11,976,000	11,976,000	0
Total-----	11,976,000	35,274,000	+23,298,000
Organized Reserves:			
Army-----	0	5,032,000	+5,032,000
Navy and Marines-----	11,886,000	11,886,000	0
Air Force-----	5,054,000	5,054,000	0
Total-----	16,940,000	21,972,000	+5,032,000
Total Reserve-----	28,916,000	57,246,000	+28,330,000
Grand total-----	3,166,432,000	2,599,562,000	-566,870,000

Nothing in this report should be interpreted to mean that the committee lacks faith in the Department of Defense or the three services, nor in any of the dedicated individuals who appeared before the committee. On the contrary, the committee is proud of the Defense Establishment. It is felt, however, that as in all complex human endeavors, there is always room for improvement. This is a field which requires understanding and cooperation between all branches of government. The committee's actions and recommendations, while quite critical of certain areas, are made with constructive intent only.

UNITED STATES MILITARY POLICY

Predicated on a basic national policy of nonaggression supported by the belief that a sound economy is essential to the security of the free world, it can be stated that the military policy of the United States consists of four basic interrelated and mutually supporting concepts. The foregoing represents in the committee's mind a general and broad résumé of the sum total of the various policies enunciated by senior Defense officials in statements before this committee over the past several years and focalized during hearings this year. It is quite obvious to the committee that all military personnel and

senior civilian officials with the Department of Defense do not agree amongst each other as to the relative importance of these four areas. In fact, each service seems to place its own unilateral measurement upon each one. Nevertheless, it is clear to the committee that these are the prime concepts upon which the various services are basing their requirements for forces. They are:

- (1) Warning (because the enemy can be expected to move first).
- (2) Retaliation (an offensive strike capability second to none in the event of an enemy attack).
- (3) Defense (either 100 percent or sufficient to deter attack and protect retaliation forces).
- (4) Limited war capability (that capability sufficient to handle "brush fires" or to move strategically in sufficient time and with adequate force to avoid the loss of vital strategic areas and if possible to prevent the outbreak of general war).

This bill contains authorizations designed to meet certain construction requirements relative to the above. Obviously a single bill cannot satisfy all of these requirements. While certain specific details are classified, it is possible to discuss many of the salient ones.

WARNING CONCEPT

All witnesses appeared convinced that we must establish and maintain the best possible warning system. Otherwise the adherence to a policy of nonaggression could prove fatal, especially in an era where reaction time is at a premium. The committee emphatically concurs in this concept. The warning systems must be attuned not only to the military requirements of threat from manned bombers, ballistic missiles and submarines, but also to international diplomatic and political threats. The basic military warning systems consist of:

DEW line

The distant early warning (DEW) line is designed to flash instant warning to a joint Canadian-United States combat operations center located at Colorado Springs, Colo. This headquarters is called the North American Air Defense Command (NORAD). It is designed to be effective against manned bombers and cruise type missiles, but it cannot presently cope with intercontinental ballistic missiles. It consists of a string of radar stations stretching from Point Barrow, Alaska in the west to Baffin Island in the east and then with eastward and westward extensions into the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, respectively.

Title III (Air Force) contains an authorization request in the amount of \$25 million for the eastward extension.

The program to establish a distant early warning (DEW) line resulted from the consideration of many studies, official and unofficial, of what was needed for the early detection of an air attack upon the United States. The specific recommendation that the United States establish a DEW line came from the Lincoln Summer Study Group, which met in the summer of 1952 to discuss and study air defense problems. This group, composed of scientists, engineers, and military personnel, recommended that a line be established across extreme northern Alaska and Canada to (1) make surprise attack most difficult; (2) improve active and passive defensive capabilities; (3) minimize

disruptive disorganization upon attack; and (4) make possible the concept of effective "defense in depth."

Following the summer study group recommendations, presentations on concepts were made to high level Government agencies. As a result, the Air Research and Development Command of the Air Force was given responsibility, in late 1952, for developing techniques. In this program, the Air Research and Development Command, with Western Electric Co. as a prime contractor, constructed and tested a prototype facility in the United States.

In 1954, Western Electric Co. was given a prime contract to prepare an outline plan and systems engineering study for a warning system in the Arctic, and to proceed with the architectural work and plans for implementing the entire project. 1954 is considered as the date when the active portion of the project to implement DEW line began; the initial portion became operational in mid-1957.

The Air Force has increased the scope of the original project to provide for eastern and western extensions of the now operational center portion. Land-based radars in Alaska and along the Aleutian Islands are being improved, installed, and integrated into the system to provide an extended capability. Also, in order that the North American portion may be tied into NATO early warning systems, the United States is extending the line to the east. The Air Force also has active plans to modernize it with newer equipment in order to keep it abreast of the increasing capabilities of modern aircraft.

DEW line, coupled with associated airborne early warning aircraft and picket ships, should provide for prompt warning of an attack on the United States by air-breathing vehicles, such as the manned bomber and cruise type missiles such as the SNARK.

While the DEW line in its present configuration will not provide early warning of an ICBM attack, this will not negate its usefulness for many years to come. The line will be a necessary part of our air defense system as long as a potential enemy has the capability of launching an attack by manned bombers and cruise type missiles. Present indications are that such a situation could exist many years into the future. Further, the DEW line is a valuable aid to navigation our own and friendly aircraft in the areas covered; this can continue indefinitely.

The Air Force states that tests of the DEW line recently conducted prove it is performing within or better than design capability. It is hoped that it will never have to be used for its intended purpose; but if it is, it will be there.

The AF states that the programed construction costs for DEW line through fiscal year 1959 are as follows:

DEW line (main)-----	\$297, 900, 000.
DEW line (west)-----	40, 000, 000.
DEW line (east)-----	45, 000, 000

The above figures, however, do not accurately portray all the totals involved. It has been estimated that the ultimate cost of DEW line will be in excess of \$1 billion and that its annual operating cost will be around \$200 million.

Mid-Canada line

DEW line is backed up by the mid-Canada line, a radar chain extending across Canada at the latitude of approximately 55°, north. It is essentially a radar fence consisting of gap-filler radars (un-

manned) that have the capability of warning of aircraft penetration. These stations cannot, however, determine direction or speed.

PINE TREE line

Extending roughly along the United States—Canadian border is the PINE TREE line, an integrated warning, tracking, and ground controlled electronic system which can direct interceptors to enemy aircraft traversing the area.

Aircraft control and warning

While DEW line is designed to provide the warning of penetration by enemy forces around the perimeter where it has been constructed, it is backed up and supported by aircraft control and warning stations located throughout the United States, Alaska, and Canada. A total of \$125,239,000 is included in the bill for these stations. The largest increment of this warning and control program is for the first phase of the programed radar improvements. This package principally provides facilities at primary radar sites in the United States for the installation of high powered systems and long-range radars to provide a frequency diversity capability in the warning system. This is designed to improve identification capabilities as well as decrease enemy capabilities to effectively utilize electronic countermeasures against our radars. The construction involved in this type of radar improvement consists primarily of the procurement and installation of enclosed radar towers and provision of large quantities of electric power for operation of the newer high powered radars.

Several new installations are included within this category. They are as follows:

Department	Name of Installation	Location	Purpose
Air Force.....	Sundance Air Force Station.....	Sundance, Wyo.....	Aircraft control and warning radar station.
Do.....	Union City Air Force Station.....	Union City, Tenn.....	Do.
Do.....	Hastings Air Force Station.....	Hastings, Nebr.....	Do.
Do.....	Pickstown Air Force Station.....	Lake Andes, S. Dak.....	Do.
Do.....	Lompoc Air Force Station.....	Lompoc, Calif.....	Do.
Do.....	P-81a.....	Dallas Center, Iowa.....	Gap filler radar site.
Do.....	P-34e.....	Alpena, Mich.....	Do.
Do.....	P-66b.....	Fibre, Mich.....	Do.
Do.....	P-66a.....	Grand Marais, Mich.....	Do.
Do.....	P-67b.....	Richlands Center, Mich.....	Do.
Do.....	P-20c.....	Marblehead, Ohio.....	Do.
Do.....	P-31b.....	Brooks, Wis.....	Do.
Do.....	P-31d.....	Mones, Wis.....	Do.

Ballistic missile detection system

While this bill contains no new request for the construction of ballistic missile detection facilities, the fiscal year 1958 supplemental bill authorized \$189 million for 3 sites. Inasmuch as ballistic missiles may have a trajectory as high as 400 to 700 miles, the radar stations to be established at these sites must have ranges of several thousand miles. It is estimated that stations planned, because of their requirement for maximum power and other highly complicated electronic gear, would cost close to a billion dollars.

All of these previously mentioned systems (DEW line, mid-Canada line, PINE TREE line, ballistic missile detection system) are to be closely integrated in the hope they will detect enemy aircraft and

missiles in sufficient time to permit our own offensive and defensive forces to go into action before an attack reaches home.

RETALIATION CONCEPT

Strategic Air Command

Currently the Strategic Air Command in the Air Force is the principal element of our retaliatory forces. All construction costs pertaining to the Strategic Air Command cannot be readily identified in this bill because in many instances the Strategic Air Command would utilize bases other than its own such as Air Defense Command facilities. However, the total program in the bill directly attributed to the Strategic Air Command, is close to \$200 million. Although operational missiles are entering into our weapons inventory and promise tremendous additions to our military capabilities, our main offensive punch is still contained in the manned bomber forces of the Strategic Air Command with its fleets of heavy jet bombers, the B-52's, and medium jet bombers, the B-47's.

The Soviets possess the advantage of initiative and surprise. Therefore, the Air Force must be capable of maintaining its strategic offensive force in the highest possible state of readiness with the least possible vulnerability to attack, and from which it can react rapidly upon receipt of tactical warning.

SAC's capability to launch its strike force in the event of a surprise attack is dependent upon four basic factors: (1) Warning; (2) alert facilities; (3) dispersal; and (4) personnel. For each of these factors, the availability of sufficient and proper facilities is a vital element in the attainment of the required degree of capability.

B-52 facilities and dispersal.—To reduce the vulnerability and increase the response capability of the heavy bomber force, the Air Force, in fiscal year 1957, initiated a program to disperse the programmed 33 B-52 squadrons on the basis of a single squadron per base. At that time, 11 bases, which had been the homes for the 11 B-36 wings, were available for adaption for use by the B-52's. Each of these 11 bases has been adapted, with some necessary additional construction, to the requirements for 1 B-52 squadron plus associated tankers.

The fiscal year 1957 construction program provided construction at 11 additional existing Air Force bases, increasing the total B-52 bases programmed to 22. In the basic fiscal year 1958 construction program, 5 more existing bases were expanded and adapted, making a total of 27 B-52 bases. The fiscal year 1958 supplemental program, approved by the committee last winter contained the first increment of construction to adapt an additional 6 existing bases which would provide the total 33 bases needed for B-52 squadron dispersal and their associated KC-135 jet refueling tanker aircraft.

The fiscal year 1959 construction program contains approximately \$66 million for additional facilities which will substantially complete current requirements for full dispersal of the 33 B-52 squadrons.

It has also been the objective of the Air Force to disperse the medium bombers on the basis of a single wing per base. Under present plans, the medium bomber force will be located on 20 bases at the end of fiscal year 1961. Construction of one of the bases, Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wis., was initiated with funds provided last year.

This program contains \$13.2 million to provide a second increment of construction.

SAC tanker relocation.—In the fiscal year 1958 supplemental program, authorization and funds were provided for construction which would permit the relocation of KC-97 tanker refueling squadrons from southern bases in the United States to locations in northern areas from which they can operate without delay in support of strike missions by the B-47 medium bombers. Against a current requirement to relocate 11 KC-97 squadrons, the fiscal year 1958 supplemental program provided the first increment of facilities for 9 squadrons on 8 existing bases.

The fiscal year 1959 program contains approximately \$33 million for additional short lead-time items for the first 9 squadrons and for the facilities needed to relocate a second squadron on one of the first 8 bases, increasing to 10 the number of squadrons relocated out of the 11-squadron requirement.

Construction is also included in this authorization bill for relocation of the 11th Squadron at Brunswick, Maine. This will permit the Air Force to deploy a KC-97 squadron at an existing naval installation on a tenant basis, and in accordance with a joint-use agreement.

Alert facilities.—The advent of an enemy ICBM threat dictates the necessity for capability, after initial warning, of a 15-minute response by the SAC forces to insure their ability to survive and strike back. Under this objective, it is planned that one-third of the SAC forces will be maintained on continuous alert. The achievement of this capability requires construction of special facilities at the SAC bases.

Construction of base facilities which directly contribute to such an alert capability was initiated in the fiscal year 1957 military construction program. This initial construction consisted only of the provision of a certain portion of the aircraft parking apron in an alert configuration on those bases expanded for the dispersal of the heavy bomber squadrons where an additional parking apron was needed. Following this principle, alert parking areas were provided at 7 heavy bomber bases by the fiscal year 1957 MCP and at 5 more heavy bomber bases by the fiscal year 1958 MCP.

In addition to alert aircraft parking areas, ready crew and security facilities, and supporting utilities are needed for full alert capability. The fiscal year 1958 supplemental program authorized the first sizable construction increment for SAC alert, with \$24.6 million provided for construction of the first ready crew and alert facilities as well as alert pavements at additional bases for both medium bombers and heavy bombers.

The \$80.9 million included in this request for alert facilities together with certain alert facilities provided as part of the dispersal package, provides short lead-time items on certain bases where projects requiring longer times for construction were started in prior years' construction programs. In addition, it provides the full alert construction requirement at bases where no long lead-time construction is necessary. This fiscal year 1959 alert package substantially completes the construction needed for achievement of the 15-minute response capability as currently planned, except for aircraft shelters in northern areas, for which the requirement has not been finally determined.

Other strategic facilities.—The remaining \$25.3 million under the strategic heading includes various operational and support facilities at overseas locations from which SAC units will operate or through which they will stage in wartime operations and at which they conduct peacetime maneuvers and rotation training missions. In addition, this package provides special ordnance storage facilities at SAC bomber bases in the United States.

Complete cost estimates for SAC to date were not available. It is estimated that approximately one-third of the Air Force budget for fiscal year 1958 and fiscal year 1959 is devoted to SAC.

Ballistic missiles

In the basic fiscal year 1958 and prior years' programs, authorization was provided for research, test, and training facilities at various locations for both the intercontinental and intermediate range ballistic missiles and to develop the first operational site for the ATLAS ICBM at Cooke Air Force Base, Calif., and to initiate construction of a second operational site for the ATLAS ICBM at Warren Air Force Base, Wyo.

The ATLAS program has been accelerated by means of the fiscal year 1958 supplemental construction authorization which Congress approved earlier in this session. That construction program accelerated the completion date for the first operational site at Cooke and the operational facilities for the first squadron at Warren Air Force Base. The authorization provided by the fiscal year 1958 supplemental program also has been applied to the construction of facilities for additional ATLAS squadrons.

It had been planned originally, under the fiscal year 1958 supplemental, to construct additional facilities at Warren Air Force Base for ATLAS squadrons prior to proceeding with construction at additional sites. However, upon completion of the planning for these facilities, it was found that the construction activity which would be involved at Warren, was of such magnitude that it could not be efficiently or economically accomplished and that completion of operational facilities for these squadrons would be delayed. It was determined, therefore, that to provide a greater number of operational ATLAS sites at earlier dates, it was necessary to initiate construction at additional sites. Under this plan, facilities are being provided simultaneously at Warren Air Force Base, Wyo.; Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr.; and Fairchild Air Force Base, Wash.

The largest package in the strategic portion of this fiscal year 1959 construction program provides \$165.9 million for ballistic missiles. This amount includes authorization for construction of operational ATLAS facilities at one additional location, not yet firmly selected, and support facilities for both the previously programed and the new ATLAS site. It also includes authorization for the construction of hardened facilities for the TITAN ICBM. In addition, the fiscal year 1959 program provides for construction of operational facilities for the intermediate range ballistic missile at overseas locations and for test and training facilities for both the ICBM and the IRBM at Cooke AFB.

Other strategic missiles.—\$29.6 million are included in the program for strategic missiles other than the ballistic type. This package contains facilities for the HOUNDDOG and the QUAIL air-to-surface missiles carried by the Strategic Air Command B-47 and B-52

bombers to provide them with greater penetration capability. The package also provides facilities in the United States for the GOOSE which is a surface-to-surface air-breathing missile with an intercontinental range. Facilities for the GOOSE missile also were authorized in fiscal year 1958.

SNARK

Also in the Strategic Air Command arsenal is the air-breathing intercontinental missile SNARK which is capable of carrying nuclear warheads against distant targets with great accuracy. The first SNARK unit has already been activated and is in the process of being manned and equipped. The first SNARK missile base is being constructed at Presque Island, Maine. No new funds were requested in this year's bill for SNARK facilities. The committee strongly questions this apparent diminishing of SNARK's importance for the committee has become convinced that the addition of further SNARK squadrons to our arsenal is highly desirable.

Navy contribution to retaliatory forces

It might well be said that the entire fleet at sea constitutes a most important segment of this Nation's strike capability. It is difficult to distinguish between categories of the Navy's capabilities due to the extreme flexibility and mobility inherent in modern naval forces. Especially worth mentioning is the POLARIS missile being developed by the Navy which gives great promise of becoming one of the decisive weapons in the history of warfare. Certain funds are included in the bill for the construction of POLARIS facilities; the details are classified. It is the committee's view, however, that the Department of Defense could well have requested additional authorizations for this weapon. It sincerely hopes that Department of Defense will provide the Navy with the highest priority in the development of POLARIS and will remove any obstacles which might prevent the earliest possible deployment of the POLARIS system in an operational configuration.

JUPITER

While JUPITER is an Army-developed weapon, its operational assignment has been given to the Air Force. It has similar characteristics to the THOR. JUPITER's success to date indicates that it apparently can be fully operational in the immediate future. The committee notes with interest and some concern, the duplication of effort between JUPITER and THOR. It can understand the need for some duplication in research and development. It cannot condone duplication in operational deployments. The committee certainly hopes the Secretary of Defense will, if this type of duplication is imminent, make a decision based on the relative merits of the two weapons and not on the understandable service pride in authorship.

DEFENSE CONCEPT

All weapons systems can rightly be cataloged in certain of their applications as supporting the concept of defense. In this report the committee directed itself only to those which pertain to the continental air defense field.

Under the command of the North American Air Defense Command (NORAD), Colorado Springs, Colo., there are assigned approximately

200,000 Americans and Canadians along with nearly 2,000 aircraft and hundreds of antiaircraft weapons. Predicated upon the information flashed to NORAD by the warning system, the NORAD command control system depends upon the semiautomatic ground environment system (SAGE) and related facilities as a medium of controlling and coordinating its various weapons.

SAGE

The SAGE (semiautomatic ground environment) system, under present plans, involves the construction of technical and support facilities for 36 SAGE centers (computers) for 29 SAGE sectors (locations). SAGE centers 1 through 26 have been constructed or initiated with authorizations provided in the fiscal year 1958 supplemental and prior construction programs. The fiscal year 1959 authorization request includes \$41.1 million for technical facilities for SAGE centers 27 through 31, support facilities for centers previously authorized, and communications facilities at various radar sites to tie their operation into the automatic features of the SAGE system. It is estimated that the SAGE system will eventually cost approximately \$1 billion and require approximately \$400 million for its annual operation.

Joint manual direction centers.—\$16.9 million are included in the program to provide the Air Force portion of a joint Army-Air Force operated missile defense center system inside the United States. Present plans call for a number of centers in this system, also known as the Missile Master, with the Air Force being the host at some centers, and the Army being the host at the other centers.

This authorization request will provide technical and support facilities at the Air Force locations and technical facilities only at the Army locations.

Fighter interceptors

There are approximately 70 squadrons of Air Force interceptors of 25 planes each assigned to NORAD. These consist of the F-100 series fighters with the old F-86 Sabrejet and the Lockheed F-94 Starfire being gradually phased out as newer planes are deployed. No specific overall cost estimation of the fighter-interceptor effort is available at the time of this printing. However, set out below are certain cost estimations from which some conclusions can be drawn.

[In millions]

1 fighter-interceptor squadron

INITIAL INVESTMENT		ANNUAL COSTS	
Aircraft and spare parts.....	\$40.0	Pay and personnel.....	\$5.0
Equipment.....	.3	Equipment replacement.....	2.0
Facilities.....	25.0	Supply.....	3.0
Training.....	8.0	POL.....	.5
Total.....	73.3	Total.....	10.5

The committee has been informed that in all likelihood certain of the fighter-interceptor squadrons will be phased out as BOMARC is deployed.

BOMARC (IM-99)

BOMARC is a surface-to-air long-range interceptor guided missile of supersonic speed designed to operate at high altitudes. It is pro-

duced by Boeing Aircraft Co. It launches vertically and cruises on twin ramjet engines at a speed faster than sound. It is guided by the latest available electronic systems. BOMARC has been successfully tested in a series of firings from Patrick Air Force Base, Fla., against high-flying drone aircraft over the ocean. The BOMARC's range should enable it to destroy enemy planes at a far greater distance than any other missile assigned to NORAD.

Ninety-two million dollars for the construction of BOMARC sites is included in the Air Force request (originally this amount was \$122 million but the Air Force revised its estimates). Construction of facilities for this missile was initiated in the fiscal year 1958 construction program at four locations: McGuire Air Force Base, N. J.; Suffolk County Air Force Base, N. Y.; Otis Air Force Base, Mass.; and Dow Air Force Base, Maine. The fiscal year 1959 request will add facilities at 10 additional locations: Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, N. Y.; Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Vt.; Kinross Air Force Base, Mich.; Duluth Municipal Airport, Minn.; Langley Air Force Base, Va.; Truax Field, Wis.; Paine Air Force Base, Wash.; Camp Adair Air Force Station, Oreg.; Travis Air Force Base, Calif.; and Cooke Air Force Base, Calif.

The committee estimates that if the BOMARC system is developed as currently envisaged, it may cost as much as—if not more than—\$6 billion.

Army Air Defense Command

The Army's structure within the North American Air Defense Command is the second largest Army combat command in the world. It has been stated that approximately 7 to 10 percent of the entire Army effort is devoted to this activity. The basic weapons assigned or soon to be assigned to Army units are the NIKE family (AJAX, HERCULES, ZEUS, and HAWK).

NIKE-AJAX

Named after Nike, the Greek goddess of victory, the NIKE-AJAX is a supersonic surface-to-air missile designed to intercept and destroy enemy aircraft or air breathing missiles. It is the only fully operational surface-to-air missile system in the free world today. It uses a command guidance system employing one radar to track the target and another to track the missile. A computer receives data from the radar and calculates the commands required to bring the NIKE into interceptor course.

Approximately 60 battalions of AJAX are now deployed around key industrial and highly populated strategic areas. AJAX is a missile about 20 feet long and 1 foot in diameter; uses a solid propellant booster and a liquid sustaining motor. There are approximately 100 officers and men in a NIKE battery.

NIKE is being superseded and replaced in part by NIKE-HERCULES.

NIKE-HERCULES

This is a further improvement on the original AJAX. It is a similar type missile and design is similar type proportions. Its range and other operational characteristics are considerably better than AJAX, however. It is a dart-shaped missile, 27 feet long, assisted by a 14½-foot-long booster. It uses solid propellant throughout. It can carry

an atomic warhead. It is produced through the combined efforts of Army Ordnance Corps, Western Electric Co., the Bell Telephone Laboratories, and the Douglas Aircraft Co., together with essential subcontractors.

If the NIKE (AJAX and HERCULES) systems are developed in accordance with certain existing plans, the committee estimates that the combined total cost will be in the neighborhood of \$6 billion.

HAWK

This is a missile designed to reinforce the low altitude capability of our defense system. It is the only weapon capable of a low altitude defense currently being placed in inventory. HAWK is also a supersonic surface-to-air guided missile with exceptionally high rate of fire and very short reaction time. It is designed not only to meet static situations but also deployment with tactical field forces.

It uses solid propellant, is approximately 16 feet long and 14 inches in diameter. The Raytheon Manufacturing Co. of Massachusetts is the prime contractor with Northrup Aircraft of California as the major subcontractor.

Missile Master

Important to the control and operation of previously mentioned antiaircraft missiles is the Missile Master which is a combination of electronic computing equipment designed to coordinate large numbers of surface-to-air projectiles. By electronic means it converts target location to usable data and transmits rapidly changing information instantaneously to the various controlling locations.

As stated before, this year's construction authorization bill originally contained in the Army title a little better than \$137 million for facilities incident to the NIKE-AJAX and HERCULES, HAWK, and Missile Master.

ZEUS

The Army has been assigned the responsibility of developing the Antiballistic Missile. When developed, it is contemplated that it will be deployed around key installations both military and civil. ZEUS is part of the NIKE family.

This bill contains a request for authorizations in the amount of approximately \$30 million. It is estimated that perhaps the ZEUS system will cost on the order of \$4 to \$5 billion when finally deployed and operational.

As can be seen by the foregoing, the effort and resources the country is putting into continental defense systems is tremendous and a little bit frightening. If all systems are fully developed and deployed, it would not be illogical to assume we might well find certain installations defended by fighter interceptors, BOMARC, NIKE-AJAX, NIKE-HERCULES, HAWK and NIKE-ZEUS, with their attendant SAGE and Missile Master controlling systems.

The committee has become increasingly concerned over this potential duplication. While it compliments those who have developed these systems, for their ingenuity and dedication, it does not believe that all are essential. The committee is especially concerned about the heavy deployment of missiles requiring stockpiles of nuclear warheads immediately adjacent to heavy centers of population. It can understand the need to insure the protection of military bases where strike forces are stationed; it cannot understand the heavy

concentration in industrial and heavily populated centers with the attendant publicity implying that the deployment of these weapons at such locations constitutes no hazard and provides complete security from attack.

Duplication of Air Defense Weapons Systems

The committee is and has been for sometime, greatly concerned about the possible duplication of weapons systems and their attendant excessive costs and waste of effort. As can be seen by the preceding paragraphs, the weapons in existence and being developed for the defense of the continental United States are many and varied. Two years ago, in the fiscal year 1957 military construction authorization bill, the committee was presented with requests for authorizations pertaining to construction of facilities for NIKE-AJAX and TALOS ground-to-air missiles. The AJAX was to be used in connection with the Army's point defense responsibilities, and the TALOS was part of the Air Force area defense mission. At that time, the committee in its report, stated:

The committee concluded that both the Army and the Air Force are assigned overlapping roles and missions in the anti-aircraft and continental air defense fields. While the Air Force views its mission as one of area defense, and the Army views its as perimeter or point defense, it is clear that a definite and urgent need exists for the Department of Defense to quickly and positively clarify the specific responsibility of each service. The committee believes that unless concise responsibilities are assigned, duplication of weapons systems costing in the multibillion dollar range might result, and that such duplication would obviously be too costly as well as inexcusable from the military standpoint.

The committee then denied the authorization for the establishment of TALOS sites and called upon the Secretary of Defense to make a determination. Subsequently in his memorandum of November 26, 1956, the Secretary of Defense assigned TALOS to the Department of the Army.

The committee took the action of denying the authorization for TALOS not because it believed that TALOS was an ineffective weapon; on the contrary, testimony indicated that it gave promise of being ideally suited for a role in the air defense system. The committee felt then as it does now that Congress should not be called upon to make a determination between the relative merits of weapons systems each of which was strongly supported by its developers; that this was a responsibility that should be accepted by the Department of Defense.

In May 1958, the chairman of the committee received the following letter from the Department of the Army with reference to the future production of TALOS:

MAY 2, 1958.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
United States Senate.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In conformance with the Department of the Army's policy to keep you and the members of your committee informed of Army affairs, it is desired to acquaint you with actions being taken concerning the land based TALOS missile.

Based on the review and decision of higher authority not to employ the land based TALOS system due to budgetary limitations, it became necessary for the Army to terminate the TALOS production contract with RCA yesterday, May 1, 1958.

While this action results in termination of the manufacture of TALOS land based systems, the production of certain components, basically computers and tracking radars, will be continued for utilization in the research and development areas on other Army programs.

Remaining in effect between RCA and the Army is the contract to complete evaluation of the TALOS land based system. This evaluation is being performed on the R&D model installed at White Sands Proving Ground.

Sincerely,

J. H. MICHAELIS,
Major General, GS,
Chief of Legislative Liaison.

Even though qualified witnesses who appeared before the committee had stated that "TALOS ranks with the best in Air Defense systems. This country needs all it can buy.", the decision has now been reached that TALOS is no longer required. Yet had the committee authorized the funds requested in the fiscal year 1957 military construction authorization bill, there can be no doubt that TALOS sites would now be established adjacent to NIKE-AJAX installations.

Now a similar situation apparently exists with regard to NIKE-HERCULES and BOMARC. The same arguments exist regarding point and area defense. A glance at the classified deployments projected for these missiles indicates that in many, many instances it is planned to locate each in the same area for the purpose of defending the same installation. The committee has reviewed this subject most thoroughly—not only this session but also during the 2 preceding years. Each service has defended its own program with honest vigor and conviction—yet it is most obvious to the committee that the Army and the Air Force continue to have overlapping responsibilities in the air defense missile field—and that their respective programs duplicate each other.

The committee does not intend to imply that complete defense measures should not be taken for certain specified areas; but defense of the "fortress" or fixed position type can be carried too far, especially if the costs incident to the defensive system in any manner reduces the capacity of the strike forces. In fact, such a policy could well be fatal militarily and equally if not more important, from the economic standpoint.

In classified briefings, overlays shown of existing and planned defensive systems indicate the eventual deployment of at least four systems superimposed upon each other and blanketing the entire continent. While each system has its own special characteristics, these overlays clearly indicate areas of overlap where one system might well perform the function of its neighbor. Each of these systems is estimated to cost in excess of \$3 to \$4 billion (some, as shown before, as high as \$6 billion). Granted, these plans and proposed programs have not all received official OSD or JCS approval. Nevertheless, the committee's experience is that such programs have a habit of being approved by default through the medium of piecemeal submission on an annual basis without regard to the accumulation of long-range

contingent liabilities. (In fact, the committee suspects that in some instances where the JCS cannot agree on duplicating systems, it slightly reduces each in scope and proceeds to develop both.)

It is the committee's firm and unanimous opinion that decisions must be made to eliminate duplication otherwise the annual cost of the defense budget will require increases beyond all reasonable proportions.

Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy indicated his thoughts concerning future Defense budgets as shown in the following excerpts from the published record of his press conference held on June 19, 1958, at Quantico, Va.:

Mr. NORRIS (Washington Post). Could you indicate what size that budget is? There have been some reports that it would go up tremendously.

Secretary McELROY. Well, there has been no approval of the budget by the administration as a whole.

Mr. NORRIS. I meant the future trend.

Secretary McELROY. Well, you mean how high it could ultimately—

Mr. NORRIS. There have been reports that it would go up to 60 or 70 billion within a decade if you continued with the size of forces and all the programs.

Secretary McELROY. I think that could well be.

Mr. NORRIS. You think that could be?

Secretary McELROY. Yes, I do.

Mr. NORRIS. Does that—does the study show that?

Secretary McELROY. No, we haven't gone that far. In fact, I don't think there is much use really in making a projection for 10 years ahead with technological advances proceeding as they do. That figure of 60 to 70 is in my opinion a pretty breezy figure, but I can tell you that it wouldn't be difficult for that kind of addition to have to be required if we continue with the size forces we have.

The committee feels that major policy decisions must be made immediately in order to establish how far the country should go in developing fixed defenses.

Last year, the committee stated: "The committee requests the Secretary of Defense to take vigorous action to insure that only those systems are approved and maintained that fit in with the overall strategic doctrine * * *." The committee feels that it is again pertinent to quote from Henry Kissinger's article in Foreign Affairs magazine of April 1957, entitled "Strategy and Organization":

In the absence of a generally understood doctrine, all actions will of necessity prove haphazard; conflicting proposals will compete with each other without an effective basis for their resolution. Each problem, as it arises, will seem novel and energies will be absorbed in analyzing its nature rather than in seeking solutions. Our services will find it impossible to make a meaningful choice among the mass of the new weapons with which their research and development programs will soon overwhelm them. We will continue to cede the initiative to others and our course will become increasingly defensive.

Witnesses before the committee have indicated that if all the defense systems currently being contemplated by each service were to be established, the total cost would be close to \$8 billion per year for the next 5 years and \$5 billion annually thereafter.

Secretary McElroy has stated, "The capital investment already made in this continental air defense system during the last 4½ years exceeds \$13 billion. The cost of operation is now almost \$2 billion a year." Information in the committee files indicates that Secretary McElroy's figures may be on the low side. Nevertheless, they serve to show the order of magnitude.

Defense versus offense

It can be argued that "the country can never have enough defense" and that duplication of weapons systems is not really duplication, but provides necessary flexibility. The committee takes strong objection to this point of view. It is of the opinion that the best defense is still a strong offense.

General Carl von Clausewitz, writing around 1812, lists in his *Principles of War* certain general principles for defense. Principle No. 6 states in part:

The fundamental principle is never to remain completely passive, but to attack the enemy frontally and from the flanks, even while he is attacking us.

And again—

The art of entrenchment * * * shall serve the defender not to defend himself more securely behind a rampart, but to attack the enemy more successfully. This idea should be applied to any passive defense.

In his principle No. 7, Clausewitz states in the first sentence:

This attack from a defensive position can take place the moment the enemy actually attacks, or while he is still on the march.

The second paragraph of his principle No. 13 states:

If you remember, * * *, the few defensive battles that have ever been won, you will find that the best of them have been conducted in the spirit of the principles voiced here. For it is the study of the history of war which has given us these principles.

Too great a defensive psychology can only result in a "Magenot line" concept. Defensive operations, in the opinion of the committee, should not be hampered by the absence of initiative which the committee believes is inherent in fixed positions. The Magenot line proved this. In the committee's opinion that a "100 percent defensive psychology is a will-o'-the-wisp which has led nations committed to it, to defeat or bankruptcy or general war." We must certainly provide adequate defense for our striking or retaliatory forces, but we must establish our true defense on mobility, dispersal, striking power, and more important, diplomatic and military policies designed to prevent war; such cannot be divorced from economic stability.

In writing in 1949, Dr. Vannevar Bush, in *Modern Arms and Free Men*, had this to say on defense in a period of atomic stalemate:

If at that time we tried to make our situation utterly immune we should certainly lose the race, for to seek utter immunity would take all of our resources for that purpose alone, and even then complete immunity would probably not be attainable. It will take resolution and calm thinking to hew to the line if that time comes. It will take a highly effective system of national military planning, a far better one than we have now.

He further states:

The important points are, first, that we should never become so obsessed with a defense system as to invite disaster by relying upon it to the detriment of retaliatory striking power, and second, that such defensive measures as we take should be employed against specific, real threats and undertaken with proper timing.

COMMITTEE ACTION

In light of the foregoing, the committee has concluded we must place greater emphasis on our striking power and "limited war" capabilities. We must make decisions to eliminate duplication in defensive weapons systems, and the defensive weapons systems which we retain should not be designed in the futile attempt to obtain 100 percent defense but rather to insure the security of our striking capability. The committee has reason to believe that it is not alone in this philosophy. Many witnesses appearing before the committee on other subjects have so indicated in response to questioning by committee members. When Gen. Carl Spaatz appeared before the full committee on July 9, in response to a request to testify on the Defense reorganization plan, the following colloquy took place:

Senator STENNIS. Now, going to another subject of yours here, you mentioned these different weapons systems being stacked on top of one another, particularly with reference to the NIKE group and BOMARC.

We have before us now the military construction bill, General, that has the approval of the Budget Bureau and the approval of the Department of Defense, that carries with it the additional NIKE sites, additional installations for that weapon, those batteries, and also the BOMARC, which is a related missile.

It is similar, as you know, to what TALOS was at one time.

I personally think they ought to make a choice between those weapons, but I have a layman's attitude, not knowing anything about the military and I don't want to sit in judgment on matters from a military standpoint.

But the Secretary of Defense now clearly has the authority, does he not, to make those choices, and hasn't he by virtue of the fact that he has already approved both of them?

General SPAATZ. I would like to comment on that in this way: That if I, as a military man, would take those overlays

and arrange these forces so there would be the minimum of duplication and the most effective possibility of use of all the weapons systems involved, that the rearrangement would result in quite a few military installations in the United States being cut out.

Senator STENNIS. We had this up and it is going into large sums of money and we had it up last year and the year before and the various departments just stood toe to toe and said both systems were necessary, and it looked like duplication to us and we put out warning signs, but didn't feel that we were the ones to be the final judges.

That was TALOS and NIKE and now TALOS has passed out of the picture but BOMARC has come in and the question is still virtually the same as to which one is going to be used.

General SPAATZ. Yes.

Senator STENNIS. And they both run along together.

General SPAATZ. Yes, sir. Of course, that is a decision that must be made in the Department of Defense.

Admiral Radford on the same date, in response to similar questions, had this to say, in part:

Admiral RADFORD. I hesitate to call myself up to date on it. After all, I have been retired for nearly a year. But I would say that the subjects you have been discussing here today, the continental defense of the United States, is a field that has concerned me for a long time.

I think that we have made plans that have become outmoded, but there is a great reluctance to change the plans or to eliminate something.

The committee has, therefore, taken the following action:

It will be remembered that \$137 million or 39 percent of the Army's authorization request pertains to construction of facilities for NIKE-HERCULES, HAWK, and Missile Master; and that \$92 million of the Air Force program pertains to BOMARC. The committee has deleted these two amounts from titles I and III of the bill, respectively, and has added the sum of \$183 million to title IV. This results in a reduction of the combined total request for NIKE-HERCULES, etc., and BOMARC by 20 percent, and authorizes the Secretary of Defense to construct for the Department of the Army or the Department of the Air Force such defense missile sites as he deems essential for the proper security of the Nation.

The 20 percent reduction was taken from the sum of the \$137 million Army figure and the \$92 million Air Force on the basis that it seems reasonable to assume that immediate and tangible savings can be effected in this area if a decision is made—as the committee expects.

When Secretary McElroy appeared before the full committee on the reorganization bill, he was questioned on this subject. He answered in part, stating:

Referring to the continental defense picture which I have asked to be evaluated by the Weapons System Evaluation Group, which is the group of scientists who advise the Joint Chiefs and the Secretary. And this also has to do with a

group of systems which appear to overlap in the continental defense picture.

The committee also notes with interest that Secretary McElroy in the minutes of the press conference held at Quantico, Va., on Thursday, June 19, 1958, indicated that this was an area where decisions had to be reached.

The committee expects him to make a choice. The committee is of the opinion that the adoption of one—with the resultant increased emphasis on it—while discarding another, could have the twofold effect of strengthening both our economy and our military posture.

In taking this action, the committee emphasizes that it is not establishing the precedent of making all authorizations or appropriations directly to the Secretary of Defense. On the contrary, it is simply carrying out prerogatives of Congress relative to its right to authorize and appropriate in specified areas. Nor should this action be taken to indicate in any manner that the committee believes that the Secretary of Defense does not already possess sufficient authority to make decisions in this field. In fact, during the reorganization hearings, Secretary McElroy was asked the following question (pertaining to the NIKE, TALOS matter):

* * * Why would it take so long to get a decision, and does this illustrate the kind of authority you were talking about needing?

Secretary McElroy replied:

I think it is something of an illustration although that authority, in my judgment, remains with the Secretary under the previous legislation.

Nevertheless, it is clear that a final decision has not been reached, and the committee takes this action as a method of focusing the problem and in underlining its belief that Congress should not be called upon to determine the relative merits of competing military weapons systems.

In authorizing the status of the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) and recommending in this bill that ARPA be authorized \$50 million for construction of facilities pertaining to new weapons systems, the committee is further strengthened in the philosophy that the Secretary of Defense must make the decisions on new systems before they are presented to Congress. It might be said that HERCULES and BOMARC are not new systems. Yet testimony taken by the committee indicates that Defense officials when they say "new systems," refer to missiles and other recent developments not considered as belonging in the conventional field. The following are extracts from the transcript of the committee's hearings on the reorganization bill:

Chairman RUSSELL. A provision to the bill gives the Secretary of Defense the authority to assign or to reassign to one or more departments or services the development and operational use of new weapons and weapons systems. Would you construe that proviso as an inferential limitation on your present authority or other authority contained in the bill to reassign the development and operational use of existing weapons or weapons systems?

Secretary McELROY. I had not thought of it as carrying that inference, Mr. Chairman. I believe that the reason for the inclusion of that provision by the House committee was in order that there should not be any inability on the part of the Secretary to move in assigning to an individual service the operational responsibility for new weapons, and that was given in testimony as one of the problems, the lack of such authority was one of the problems, that had been involved in the proliferation of the entire missile production.

I think without much doubt on the missile area we have produced more missiles than were needed and we have duplicated in ways which were wasteful of the taxpayers' money.

If you will recall, the House committee and the House itself declined to grant the President's request for authority to consolidate functions, and I believe that the reason that this provision was made with respect to new weapons was that even though the denial was made of the right to consolidate functions, the assignment of new weapons was regarded as an important right for the Secretary to exercise.

On the point of inferential denial of the right on other than new weapons, I had not thought that was true.

May I ask Mr. Coolidge whether he has that feeling in looking at the language?

Mr. COOLIDGE. I consider that the doubt here was whether new weapons meant something that was not in existence at the date this act was passed, and I would construe that to be not so. What new weapons here would mean would be weapons that are nonconventional weapons. Missiles, for instance, would be new weapons even though they are in existence, and I think the Secretary is right that the House, when it limited so severely the power to abolish functions, wanted to make it clear that that would not be mechanics that the Secretary would have to go through in regard to these new or nonconventional weapons. I would suppose that it did not reflect on the power to do other transfer if he complied with the new sections in the House bill.

The new sections in the House bill do limit the Secretary's power that he has under the existing law in that he has to wait for 30 days, if it is a noncombatant function, which he would not have to do under the existing law.

I do not know whether that supplements the Secretary's answer, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. It all ties the question up with whether a weapon is a function, and it seems to me that this is a matter that ought to be clarified before this bill is enacted on the transfer of weapons systems.

Mr. COOLIDGE. I suppose it comes in as a function in that the Army, for instance, has capability under its roles and missions of long-range artillery, and a missile can be certainly construed as long-range artillery, and to that extent the handling of a weapon might be said to be part of their combatant functions, but weapons themselves I would suppose are not functioned.

Chairman RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, do you think that the bill as it is presently drafted and the power that it gives you with respect to research and development and the assignment of research and development would be sufficient to solve for the Congress the responsibility for any future waste and duplication in such fields as the missile field?

Secretary McELROY. I do not suppose it is possible to absolve Congress from having its share of responsibility in practically all of these matters, because Congress does have the responsibility for authorizing funds to finance them, and in the course of these money authorization bills, a thorough examination is made of all of our programs, so I doubt very much if there could be a complete absolution of any responsibility on the part of Congress.

I do think this, however: That there should be a far more efficient application of administrative ability to avoid waste. We have recently been talking about some of these matters and feel that the problem begins at the time of the conception of a new weapon, when you start that initial feasibility study, and if you can control the development of the program at that stage and not let it get to the stage of at least partial production or the building up of plant facilities production, you can in my judgment very sharply reduce the wasteful use of funds.

Chairman RUSSELL. I asked the question because power in a Government such as ours always assumes responsibility. If there is a vested power it is usually accompanied by an equivalent responsibility. There has been so much discussion about the responsibility for the waste that has occurred here before, I would assume that the consolidation of power that this bill carries, why it could not of course absolve Congress of the responsibility for appropriating and if we concentrate responsibility for waste and duplication, certainly it grants all the powers that Congress could possibly have to deal with that subject to the executive branch of the Government.

The committee reiterates that action taken herein is not a precedent for denying future authorizations and appropriations directly to the services. The committee believes that the identity of the services should be preserved—but not for the purpose of perpetuating duplication in instances where obviously a decision must be made.

LIMITED WAR CONCEPT

This is another area of controversy. Hardly any two authorities can agree on the proper definition of the subject. Nevertheless, all the services have, in their own manner, provided certain forces for the prosecution of military activities short of actual combat or of general war.

General Pate, Commandant of the Marine Corps, stated in part when testifying before the committee, "Thus, today the Corps is providing the first echelon of the Nation's limited war force." It may be stated here that Marine units seem to have proven this in their recent deployment to the Middle East.

The Army has established the Strategic Army Corps (STRAC) and its reinforcements.

STRAC is designed to be a mobile, combat-ready force to meet the initial requirements of limited war or provide initial reinforcements in the event of general war. It consists, at the present time, of four combat-ready divisions and essential combat and logistical support.

The Strategic Army Corps reinforcement in peacetime has a mission of augmenting the training base and providing a strategic reserve in time of emergency and in case of deployment of STRAC.

Any forces of these types cannot be effective unless they have strategic mobility; i. e., the availability of adequate air and sea lift. The Marines as an integral part of the Navy have a built-in mobility the country is fortunate to possess (witness their immediate availability for deployment to Beirut). Both forces do not, in the opinion of the committee, possess sufficient airlift.

In fact, the committee is of the opinion that the airlift capability is most inadequate and cannot understand why the Army, especially, has not sought with greater vigor to insure a capability of moving its troops and equipment by air or if it has requested such, why the Department of Defense has not taken affirmative action. Obviously, one requirement is the necessary funds. It has been reported that Army officials calculate the Army should have approximately 100 C-133 type turboprop transports available for such use. Each C-133 would cost in the neighborhood of \$8 million. The committee wonders why some of the money spent on fixed defenses to date has not been utilized for this purpose; for without mobility, ground forces have little opportunity of reaching vital areas in sufficient time to merit their existence.

The committee feels most strongly that the Department of Defense should maintain a greater vigilance in establishing "limited war" capabilities. It seems obvious that if the world's two greatest powers reach a nuclear stalemate wherein differences between them cannot be resolved except by resort to total war, that the situation may well indeed be similar to that described by the phrase, "of two scorpions in a bottle," i. e. mutual annihilation. If one assumes that nuclear stalemate can be reached, one must also assume the Soviet Union would then be free to again exercise the advantage of its great superiority in numbers and interior lines of communication and that it could proceed to disrupt the world by piecemeal tactics, subversion, and other pressures backed by the presence of its conventional forces (which, indeed, it did in Hungary and seems to be doing now).

In light of this, the committee wonders why the Army has placed such a great emphasis on fixed defense (point) weapons systems which the committee believes has caused a resultant diminution of its ground combat capability (its principal and most important mission). The committee believes the Army should take stock of itself and redirect its efforts toward providing the United States with the finest force in the world capable of victorious sustained ground combat; such would be consistent with its long and glorious history developed on many famous battlegrounds.

At this point, the committee wishes to especially compliment and commend the United States Marine Corps. All can be proud of the Marine Corps, its tradition, its valor, and its courage. The com-

mittee was particularly proud the day the Marine Corps witnesses appeared before it. All officials to that date had testified on the need for new weapons systems, better machines of war, and the highly complicated gadgets of modern electronics. A Marine general, in describing the Marines' concept of operations, was the only military man who, at the conclusion of his testimony, said in substance: "Regardless of our requests for facilities and weapons, I would like to point out that we leave such decisions to the committee; for the individual fighting marine is our greatest asset and as long as we can maintain him, we have few problems."

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

MAGNITUDE OF THE PROGRAM

Thus far this report has been directed mainly toward policies and weapons systems and their resultant requirements for construction programs. The transition to the subject of military family housing at this point—before remaining operational aspects are covered—is understandable when it is realized that the housing program, in dollar value, is almost equal to the purely military one. This is why the committee indicated at the beginning of the report the overall dollar authorization (including contingent liabilities) involved in family housing so that for the first time Congress could readily see what it was being asked to approve in this area.

For the past 3 years this committee has become increasingly disturbed over the possibility of overconstruction of military family housing units. Now it believes the time has come to insure that the housing construction program is molded into something compatible with projected troop strengths and sound economic principles.

It cannot be questioned that military personnel must have adequate housing. The satisfaction of this need has long been stressed by all senior commanders as one of the prime incentives (along with pay) for retention of trained personnel. The committee has absolutely no quarrel with this philosophy. The committee does, however, have strong and fixed opinions on two aspects of the program. First, the committee is not convinced that the stated objectives (numbers of houses programed for construction) have been properly coordinated either numerically or geographically with long-range defense plans—specifically as these plans affect the troop strength; and, second, the principal method of procuring military family housing is too costly, economically unsound, and contrary to the practice of good government.

REQUIREMENTS

During the hearings, Defense witnesses stated that as of now approximately 680,000 officers and upper grade enlisted men require family housing. These requirements were listed as follows:

Military family housing requirements and assets

	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Gross requirements.....	678, 500	246, 400	¹ 167, 500	264, 600
Assets (existing and under contract).....	455, 800	154, 300	119, 250	182, 250
Military controlled.....	282, 800	110, 300	68, 250	104, 250
Community support.....	173, 000	44, 000	51, 000	78, 000
Current deficit.....	222, 700	92, 100	48, 250	82, 350
Planned construction (military).....	58, 600	12, 200	8, 550	37, 850
Projected deficit.....	164, 100	79, 900	39, 700	44, 500

¹ Shore-based personnel only.

With relation to the above tabulation, Secretary Bryant had the following to say:

I should like to comment here that a 164,000 deficit figure does not represent a programing target. It is a matter of cost and we never provide for more than 90 percent of gross requirements so that a minimum of 68,000 units should be subtracted to allow for this 10 percent safety factor. Furthermore, overall gross requirements are expected to drop by about 20,000 units by the end of fiscal year 1959. Our unfilled requirement for programing in fiscal year 1960 and later years will be, therefore, on the order of 70,000 units worldwide.

Therefore, if the better than 50,000 units requested in this bill were approved and constructed, only 70,000 units worldwide would remain needed (if the current strength remains constant).

TROOP STRENGTH

Obviously military family housing requirements have a direct relationship to the strength of the active duty forces. Last year the committee was told that the housing program at that time had a 293,201 projected deficit and that this deficit was predicated on authorized military strength of 1,027,000, Army; 857,000, Navy and Marine Corps; and 925,000, Air Force, totaling 2,810,000. This year the approximate comparative strengths in January 1958 were (at which time the military construction program was being finalized), 910,000, Army; 827,000, Navy and Marine Corps; and 877,000, Air Force, totaling a little better than 2,600,000—or approximately a 200,000 reduction from the preceding year.

The indication mentioned above by which overall gross requirements are expected to drop by about 20,000 units at the end of fiscal year 1959 is most interesting for it tends to confirm the rumor that further and more substantial cuts or reductions may be expected in the near future. In fact rumor has it that the possible future reductions are substantially greater than that experienced during the last 2 years.

The committee has mentioned in previous reports that normally it is "notified officially" of approved troop reductions through the medium of the press. The committee has grown to resent being requested to approve programs on the basis of troop strengths which have little

or no relationship to future fact. It remembers too well the case of the title VIII housing project at Fort Polk, La. In this instance a \$32 million project was canceled after ground had been broken and construction started—because of troop reductions. This failure to coordinate coming troop reductions with current construction activities is expected to cost the Government, alone, several million dollars not counting the unfortunate impact on the local community.

At this point it is interesting to note how the military strengths of our active forces have changed over the past 13 years.

[In thousands]

Date	Army	Navy	Marine	Air Force	Total
World War II peak 1945.....	8,250	3,400	485	-----	12,135
June 1950.....	590	380	74	410	1,454
June 1951.....	1,530	730	193	790	3,243
June 1952.....	1,550	820	232	980	3,305
June 1953.....	1,530	795	249	975	3,549
June 1954.....	1,400	725	224	950	3,299
June 1957.....	990	677	200	920	2,787
Jan. 1958.....	910	633	193	877	2,613
June 1958.....					
June 1961.....	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)

Of the strength as it exists today (approximately 2,600,000), nearly 1,500,000 are stationed in the continental United States and here, of course, is where the bulk of the housing units are to be constructed. At the height of the Korean war approximately 2 million personnel were stationed in the United States.

It takes but little imagination to see how the current housing requirements would be stated if the Korean strengths had remained constant until now. Had the country built for that Korean peak strength, overproduction to say the least, would have been the result.

Unless the military family housing program is closely coordinated with and held safely below the anticipated long-range troop objectives, the Federal Government may well find itself in the business of attempting to dispose of surplus housing at vacant military installations which no longer bear any relationship to the local community need—especially when the main method of furnishing military family housing is over a 25- to 30-year amortization (time payment) period. One has only to visualize the peaks and valleys in the strength of our Military Establishment over the past 30 years to see what could happen in the future. This is of special concern to the committee when it is realized that those officials now in office and responsible for incurring these obligations will have long since retired when the day arrives whereby the Government can burn its mortgages.

HOUSING REQUESTED IN THIS BILL

The summary of the family housing authorization originally proposed by the Defense Department in this bill are shown below. The 935 appropriated fund units consist of 158 for the Army, and 777 for the Air Force. These are to be located for the most part at foreign installations where there is no possible utilization of either surplus commodity or title VIII.

	Number units Capehart in bill	Number units surplus commodity in bill	Number units MCA in bill	Total
Army-----	9,916	934	158	11,008
Navy-----	8,308	543	0	8,851
Air Force-----	28,072	5,196	777	34,045
Total-----	46,296	6,673	935	53,904

METHODS OF PROVIDING MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

As can be seen by the above, there are four current methods of providing military family housing. One is obvious by its omission from this tabulation but was shown in the preceding one. They are:

- (1) Community support.
- (2) Appropriated fund or MCA units.
- (3) Surplus commodity.
- (4) Title VIII (Capehart).

A further description of these areas is shown below. However, before going into them, the committee wishes to indicate that this year for the first time all housing to be constructed by the military are shown as line items in the construction bill. Last year the committee recommended, and Congress provided, in section 406, Public Law 241, 85th Congress, that effective July 1, 1958, no family housing project could be placed under contract unless the actual number of units involved had been specifically authorized by the annual military construction authorization bill. Therefore, this year's bill for the first time contains line items for family housing to be developed or acquired under the various methods.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

It will be noted on the preceding tabulation indicating military family housing requirements and assets, that the Department of Defense estimates among its existing assets are 455,800, and depends on approximately 173,000 units to be supplied by the local communities adjacent to the military installations. These are normally rental units, apartments, etc., constructed by private capital in anticipation of the needs of the local military installation.

The committee has long believed that under normal conditions military installations should depend upon the local community to provide from 45 to 50 percent of the housing. In many instances when new bases were established in the past, senior officials from the Department actively urged the local communities to construct these types of units and it is quite obvious that if we now move in and establish too great a percentage of Government-owned facilities, it will have quite an adverse impact upon local communities, especially the smaller ones.

APPROPRIATED FUND HOUSING

Until the advent of the Wherry housing program and its successor, the title VIII (Capehart) one, the Department of Defense depended primarily upon local community support and the construction of appropriated fund units. Now it is the announced decision of

Department of Defense to place full reliance upon the provisions of title VIII and the National Housing Act (Capehart program) and to construct appropriated fund units only at those installations where title VIII is not practicable, even though responsible officials admit that the appropriated fund method is the most economical in the long run.

SURPLUS COMMODITY HOUSING

This bill contains requests for authorization to construct approximately 6,673 units under the provisions of the Department of Defense surplus commodity housing program.

The surplus commodity housing program for the Department of Defense was first authorized by section 407, Public Law 765, 83d Congress. This authority was later amended by section 507, Public Law 161, 84th Congress, and further amended by section 411, Public Law 968, 84th Congress. In its present form this authority provides that military family housing may be constructed in foreign countries using foreign currency balances rather than through the sale of surplus commodities under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, or "through other transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation." It further provides that all such programs are subject to the approval of the Director, Bureau of the Budget.

Section 411 of Public Law 968, mentioned above, extended the authorization for the construction of family housing in foreign countries by the use of proceeds from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities from \$100 million to \$250 million. This increase was recommended because the authority is applicable to transactions arising either from Public Law 480 or the Charter Act of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The authorization contained in section 411 also provided for the use of appropriated funds in lieu of foreign currency (not more than 25 percent of the cost) on those portions of the project for which dollars would be required.

In implementing policies established relative to the previously mentioned authority, the Department of Defense states that every effort has been made to obtain family housing in foreign countries through the use of surplus commodity funds in lieu of dollar expenditures. In certain instances where it was not possible to obtain a sizable quantity of local currency through a direct sale to a nation involved, "barter" type transactions were developed to provide a source of the required funds for housing in that particular country. This barter procedure was developed between the Department of Defense and the Commodity Credit Corporation, and resulted in a memorandum of agreement dated July 6, 1956, between the Department of Defense and the Commodity Credit Corporation. In transactions of these types the Department of Defense reimburses the Commodity Credit Corporation from appropriations which would otherwise be available for the payment of quarters allowances for military personnel, and are used either in construction or acquisition under this authority after deducting necessary amounts for maintenance and operation of the housing concerned.

The status of this program is indicated by the following tabulation and the description which follows:

Department of Defense, surplus commodity housing program (status as of May 1, 1958)

	Completed and occupied		Under contract		Current execution program		Total	
	Units	Costs ¹	Units	Costs ¹	Units	Costs ¹	Units	Costs ¹
United Kingdom.....	1,500	\$15,000	797	\$11,323	1,840	\$27,600	4,137	\$53,923
Italy.....					493	7,395	493	7,395
Spain.....			² 2,027	16,142	1,061	21,220	3,088	37,362
France.....			2,700	50,000	400	8,000	3,100	58,000
Morocco.....			500	11,212	873	20,388	1,373	31,600
Iceland.....					300	6,000	300	6,000
Bermuda.....					300	6,000	300	6,000
Portugal (Azores).....					306	6,120	306	6,120
Japan.....	830	8,300	542	6,125			1,372	14,425
Okinawa.....					200	4,000	200	4,000
Philippines.....					900	18,000	900	18,000
Totals.....	2,330	23,300	6,566	94,802	6,673	124,723	15,569	242,825

¹ In thousands of dollars.

² Includes 1,581 units leased for a period of 7 years.

UNITED KINGDOM

The initial project of 1,500 housing units in the United Kingdom is completed and occupied. A second increment of 748 units and a third increment of 307 units, plus schools and chapels at certain of the locations, have been approved and are expected to be placed under construction before the end of the current fiscal year. A fourth increment of 1,840 units is planned for execution during fiscal year 1959.

ITALY

The project for 493 housing units for United States military personnel in Italy has been approved for several months and design work is complete. Actual construction has been delayed pending final acquisition of building sites by the Italian Government (at no cost to the United States). This acquisition has now been completed and construction is expected to begin in the near future.

SPAIN

A project for 334 housing units at the Naval Air Station, Rota, Spain, and a project for 92 units at three Air Force locations were placed under contract in the fall of 1957. In addition, a contract was executed for the in-leasing of 1,581 rental guaranty housing units being constructed at Madrid, Sevilla, and Zaragoza. In this case it was possible, by executing a prepaid lease for 7 years under the surplus commodity housing program, to assure the completion of this urgently required housing while keeping costs at the same levels which prevailed before the recent inflation of Spanish currency. Additional projects totaling 1,061 units are planned for execution in Spain during fiscal year 1959. These projects will be financed directly from title I, Public Law 480 funds, supplemented by 25 percent support in appropriated funds.

FRANCE

The initial project of 2,700 housing units at 19 locations in France was financed with the proceeds of a "barter" sale conducted by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the authority of its Charter Act. This construction is proceeding satisfactorily and is expected to be completed during the fall and winter of 1958-59. An additional project for 400 units in France is planned for execution during fiscal year 1959. This project will be financed from the proceeds of Public Law 480, title I, sale of agricultural commodities to France.

MOROCCO

A contract has been signed for 500 units of family housing for the 3 Air Force bases in Morocco. This project will consist of prefabricated houses purchased in Austria with the proceeds of surplus commodity sales to Austria under title I of Public Law 480. Site costs will be paid from Austrian currency and from appropriated fund dollars. An additional project for 330 units of housing at the Naval Air Station, Port Lyautey, Morocco, will make use of prefabricated houses purchased in Finland with the proceeds of title I, Public Law 480 sales to Finland. The cost of site development and erection will be paid partly through the use of appropriated funds (not to exceed 25 percent of the funded cost) and will be accomplished partly through the use of Seabee labor.

AZORES

It is planned to proceed during fiscal year 1959, with a project of 306 units of family housing at Lajes Air Force Base, Azores. The first increment of 135 units in this project will be supported with existing title I funds which have accrued from the sale of surplus commodities to Portugal. Financing of the remainder of these houses will be developed through further surplus commodity sales.

JAPAN

The original project of 1,700 units of family housing to be built at Army, Navy, and Air Force installations in Japan has now been reduced to 1,372 units as a result of the redeployment of United States forces in Japan. No further housing construction is now planned for Japan and the remaining Japanese yen have been released for other uses.

COMMODITIES UTILIZED

It is almost never possible to say precisely what commodities have gone into specific housing projects. Generally, a commodity sales agreement with a given country covers the movement of a variety of commodities, and provides for a variety of uses of the proceeds. As an example, in Spain, the total sales of commodities since the passage of Public Law 480 have amounted to \$256 million, and have included many agricultural products. Out of the total proceeds, there has to date been set aside \$16 million for the support of military family housing programs.

Attached is a list of the countries where surplus commodity funds have been obligated for housing projects, showing in summary the

commodities sold, the quantity of each, and the price paid by the receiving country.

Commodities	Quantities	Value (millions)
AUSTRIA (MOROCCO)		
Feed grains.....	10,739,000 bushels.....	\$15.3
Wheat.....	3,497,000 bushels.....	5.9
Cotton.....	69,900 bales.....	10.5
Fats and oils.....	26,257,000 pounds.....	3.4
Tobacco.....	7,519,000 pounds.....	4.8
Fruits (dried and canned).....	1,111,000 pounds.....	.2
Ocean transportation.....		3.3
Total.....		43.4
Reserved for housing: \$8.7 million.		
FRANCE		
Cotton.....	132,400 bales.....	22.5
Tobacco.....	7,716,000 pounds.....	4.5
Ocean transportation.....		.7
Total, Public Law 480 sales.....		27.7
Reserved for housing: \$6 million.		
Cotton (barter).....	373,756 bales.....	46.7
Wheat (barter).....	1,988,156 bushels.....	3.3
Total.....		50.0
Reserved for housing: \$50 million.		
JAPAN		
Wheat.....	31,030,000 bushels.....	48.6
Feed grains.....	12,270,000 bushels.....	15.0
Rice.....	2,142,000 hundredweight.....	13.7
Cotton.....	317,000 bales.....	52.8
Tobacco.....	9,839,000 pounds.....	7.7
Ocean transportation.....		12.5
Total.....		150.3
Reserved for housing: \$24.8 million.		
SPAIN		
Fats and oils.....	830,626,000 pounds.....	140.0
Cotton.....	314,800 bales.....	48.8
Feed grains.....	11,652,000 bushels.....	14.4
Wheat (for Switzerland).....	2,598,000 bushels.....	4.5
Tobacco.....	18,772,000 pounds.....	11.5
Meats (beef and ham).....	72,649,000 pounds.....	17.5
Potatoes.....	50,822,000 pounds.....	1.4
Dairy products.....	4,723,000 pounds.....	1.0
Ocean transportation.....		16.9
Total.....		256.0
UNITED KINGDOM		
Tobacco.....	50,000,000 pounds.....	38.4
Fruits.....		10.2
Total.....		48.6
Reserved for housing: \$44.7 million.		

ALTERNATIVES TO BARTER

While the Department of Defense states it is highly satisfied with the housing produced under the commodity "barter" program in France, it is recognized that the construction is only one aspect of this complex transaction. The Department of Agriculture has informed Defense that sales of cotton and wheat under the French program displaced normal dollar sales, and that in the future any housing barter transactions must be limited to commodity sales which can be demonstrated to be additional to normal marketings. Under these

circumstances Defense has no plans for further barter transactions either for military family housing or for military base construction in foreign countries, since it does not appear that transactions of any magnitude could be conducted under the revised barter program rules.

Surplus commodity housing proposed for authorization in this bill includes only those projects for which there is some possibility of generating the necessary funds through country-to-country sales (title I of Public Law 480, 83d Cong.). However, the Iceland, Okinawa, and Philippine programs involve use of third-country sales proceeds in Finland and Japan, and prospects are not bright. Although prospects are good for obtaining British sterling for the Bermuda project, it may be some time before final agreements can be reached with the Bermuda government as to the use of land and other details.

In view of the position taken by the Department of Agriculture on further barter transactions and the limited potentiality of title I programs, Defense has stated that it is giving consideration to the advisability of recommending to the Armed Services Committees a return to the guaranty rental program for some areas and extension of this program to the Pacific.

COMMITTEE OPINION AND ACTION ON SURPLUS COMMODITY HOUSING

In the past this committee has indicated its strong support to the surplus commodity program as an effective means of providing overseas family housing (almost 16,000 units have been constructed and occupied or under contract with a dollar amount approaching \$250 million). This committee originated the provisions which began the utilization of surplus commodity as a means to provide housing overseas, and takes strong exception to the position taken by the Department of Agriculture relative to the limitation of such future transactions. In a similar vein the committee does not look with favor upon the advisability of a return to the rental guaranty program and has deleted such continuing language from the bill. It expects the Secretary of Defense to discuss the subject further with the Department of Agriculture in an attempt to see if a better solution cannot be reached in order to insure that where overseas housing units are constructed a full and maximum possible utilization of the surplus commodity method will be effected.

This bill would authorize the construction of not more than 4,000 surplus commodity family housing units during fiscal year 1959.

The committee places a limitation on the number of units to be constructed in order to insure that family housing units are established at overseas locations on an austere basis in support of operational requirements only. (See that section of the report pertaining to overseas bases.)

CAPEHART PROGRAM (TITLE VIII)

It is believed that the Capehart family housing program is now familiar to all. In brief the program might simply be described as a "GI housing program for the Government." The projects are constructed by private capital and once completed and accepted by the

Government which guarantees the loan, the military departments acquire the title and the responsibility for the mortgage payments. The law places a limitation of \$16,500 as the average price per unit and a 4½ percent interest ceiling. The going market rate is currently 4¼ percent. The mortgages are amortized over a period of 25 years although pending legislation purports to extend this period to 30 years.

To summarize the Capehart program briefly, as of May 13, 1958, the Office of the Secretary of Defense has approved for development a total of 280 projects containing 99,223 units; 48 of these projects, containing 9,377 units, are presently deferred pending further evaluation of need. As shown on the attached summary these units are in the following stages of development:

	Projects	Units
Total.....	280	99,223
Completed.....	19	5,483
Under contract.....	70	35,726
Letter of acceptability issued.....	21	11,144
Advertised for bids.....	41	11,646
Under development.....	129	35,224

Title VIII (Capehart) Housing Program—Summary of development program as of May 13, 1958

	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Approved by Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations):	99,233	32,203	13,560	53,460
In process ¹	35,224	11,750	6,986	16,488
Advertised.....	11,646	2,735	0	8,911
Bidder accepted.....	11,144	1,001	4,260	5,883
Under contract ²	41,209	16,717	2,314	22,178
Private.....	12,391	4,052	225	8,114
FNMA.....	28,818	12,665	2,089	14,064
Total cost of units under contract.....	\$653,996,402	\$268,761,123	\$37,274,718	\$347,960,561
Average.....	\$15,870	\$16,077	\$16,108	\$15,689
Mortgage proceeds.....	\$622,511,397	\$254,632,516	\$35,487,183	\$332,391,698
Average.....	\$15,106	\$15,232	\$15,336	\$14,987
Private.....	\$185,724,641	\$61,263,233	\$3,438,360	\$121,023,048
FNMA.....	\$436,786,756	\$193,369,283	\$32,048,823	\$211,368,650
Appropriated funds.....	\$31,485,005	\$14,128,607	\$1,787,535	\$15,568,863
Average.....	\$764	\$845	\$772	\$702

¹ Includes 9,377 units for which development has been deferred (Army, 4,155; Navy, 3,242; Air Force 1,980).

² Includes 5,483 units in completed projects (Army, 2,167; Navy, 160; Air Force, 2,706).

COMPARATIVE COSTS

Last year the committee requested from Defense a tabulation showing comparative costs incident to the various methods of procuring housing. This comparison is shown below as follows. While the interest rates have changed since then, it is felt that the comparative information is still of value.

Cost of family housing (without land) ¹

Type of housing	20 to 25 years	50 years
Appropriated fund ² -----	\$22,842	-----
Initial cost-----	16,500	-----
Interest, at 3¼ percent-----	6,342	-----
Title VIII, Capehart ³ -----	26,543	-----
Initial cost-----	15,500	-----
Interest, at 4 percent-----	9,042	-----
Mortgage insurance premium-----	565	-----
Appropriated fund aid-----	1,000	-----
Interest, at 3¼ percent on appropriated fund aid-----	436	-----
Title VIII, Wherry (if acquired) ⁴ -----	20,000	-----
Mortgage payments (assumed from sponsor)-----	13,443	-----
Equity payment to sponsor-----	1,500	-----
Immediate minor repairs-----	500	-----
Alterations to quarters standards-----	3,500	-----
Interest on Government costs-----	1,057	-----
Title VIII, Wherry (if not acquired), quarters allowance, at \$90 per month-----	27,000	\$54,000
National average ⁵ -----	20,549	-----
Initial sales price-----	12,136	-----
Interest, at 5½ percent-----	8,423	-----
Cost of land-----	(2,664)	-----

¹ Estimated costs based on average units and on the assumption that \$90 per month (average quarters allowance) is available to pay all costs, including interest and mortgage insurance premiums in the case of FIIA-insured mortgages (Capehart and Wherry). Costs of maintenance and operation are not included since they are assumed to be the same, on the average, for all types of units.

² Initial cost is an average based on contracts recently awarded. Interest rate of 3¼ percent is based on approximate cost of money to the Government; at this rate a monthly payment of \$89.93 will pay off \$16,500 in 21 years 3 months; the total amount paid during this period would be \$22,842 (\$16,500 for principal and \$6,342 for interest).

³ Initial cost of \$15,500 plus \$1,000 of appropriated funds for site acquisition, site preparation, and off-site utilities (authorized by sec. 505, Public Law 155-82) provides a unit comparable to that obtained under MCA program. A monthly payment of \$81.84 plus the mortgage insurance premium (ranging from \$3.12 in the 1st year to 0 in the last) pays off the \$15,500 insured mortgage loan in 25 years; the total amount paid would be \$25,117 (\$15,500 for principal, \$9,052 for interest, and \$565 for mortgage insurance). Using a monthly payment of \$5.04, the \$1,000 of appropriated funds can be paid off in 23 years 9 months; the total amount paid would be \$1,436 (\$1,000 for principal and \$436 for interest).

⁴ Based on unit costing \$9,000 with \$8,100 mortgage financed at 4½ percent (under authority of sec. 10, Public Law 94-83). Assuming that unit is bought after 4 years of private operation, 333 payments (27 years 9 months) remain on the mortgage loan; at \$38.82 per month, these amount to about \$7,500 for principal and \$5,427 for interest plus \$516 for mortgage insurance. Appropriated funds must be used for equity payment to the sponsor and for minor repairs and major alterations (to bring house up to public quarters standards). Using a monthly payment of \$49.30 (balance of average quarters allowance), the total appropriated fund cost of \$5,500 at an interest rate of 3¼ percent can be paid off in 11 years 1 month; the total cost is \$6,557, including \$1,057 for interest.

⁵ Based on committee estimate of 1957 average sales price per single unit. Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates national average sales price for 1954 as \$12,300; 1955 as \$13,600; 1956 as \$14,700. All prices included land costs, which are estimated to average 18-20 percent of sales price. Interest figured on mortgage of \$10,000 at 5 percent for 25 years.

Source: Family Housing Division, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations.

This year during the hearings the committee requested up-to-date information from Defense concerning the comparative costs. This information, as furnished, is quoted as follows:

In computing the cost of time-payment housing (Capehart housing), as developed under title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, consideration must be given not only to the cost of initial construction, but also to the cost of interest and mortgage insurance premiums over the 25-year amortization term. To compute the cost of appropriated fund housing on a comparable basis, consideration should be given to the cost of money to the Government, since it is fair to assume that if the \$650 million of Capehart housing placed under contract to date had been built instead with

appropriated funds, Treasury borrowing would have been increased by a reasonably comparable amount.

Accurate comparison of construction costs for time payment versus appropriated fund housing is not possible because of differences in cost limitations and development procedures. Most military housing currently under contract is being developed under the time-payment plan; the appropriated-fund method generally is used where Capehart housing is not feasible, such as where small projects in isolated locations are required, where title is not appropriate for mortgaging, where housing for higher rank officers is needed, and in overseas areas.

The average cost of design, construction, interest, and mortgage insurance on Capehart units placed under contract in the continental United States prior to mid-May of this year is \$25,640 for the 25-year amortization period; the average cost of comparable units to be placed under contract during fiscal year 1959 would be \$27,774 based on an estimate of on-site costs at \$16,000 per unit. The following table shows the components of these cost figures:

	Past	Future
Total cost of unit.....	\$25,640	\$27,774
On-site cost ¹	15,125	16,000
Interest on principal ²	8,834	10,016
Mortgage insurance premium ³	556	588
Off-site costs ⁴	770	800
Interest on off-site costs ⁵	355	370

¹ Paid from mortgage proceeds; covers house, including range and refrigerator, and all on-site improvements, such as streets, sidewalks, landscaping, and utility distribution lines; past figure is actual average cost for 43,111 units placed under contract through May 16, 1958, including a number of units built under the previous statutory maximum of \$13,500; future figure is estimated average based on current experience and anticipated construction cost increases.

² Past is based on 4 percent and future on 4½ percent.

³ Based on ¼ of 1 percent of declining balances.

⁴ Covers site acquisition and preparation and off-site utilities and access roads. Past figure is actual average cost for 43,111 units; future figure is estimated.

⁵ Based on 3¼ percent as cost of money to the Federal Government.

Appropriated fund housing now under contract is generally not comparable to time payment housing and, therefore, directly comparable costs cannot be computed. However, there is sufficient information available to estimate the cost of a typical appropriated fund unit, which, in general, is slightly larger and has higher quality components than the Capehart unit. Assuming construction of such typical unit under conditions comparable to Capehart (projects large enough to provide benefits of mass production at reasonably accessible locations), the following table shows the components of such an estimate for a 25-year amortization period:

	Current	Future
Total cost of unit.....	\$27,777	\$30,701
On-site and off-site costs ¹	19,000	21,000
Interest ²	8,777	9,701

¹ On-site and off-site costs not separable due to contracting methods. Covers cost of house to 5-foot line, including range (but not refrigerator), site acquisition and preparation as well as both on-site and off-site improvements, such as streets, sidewalks, access roads, landscaping, and utility mains and distributing lines. Past figure is estimated average cost based on recent contract awards: actual average, which is substantially higher than \$20,000, has been discounted to allow for the preponderance of small, specialized projects. Future figure is estimated on basis of anticipated construction cost increases and anticipated higher statutory cost limits.

² Based on $3\frac{1}{4}$ percent as cost of money to the Federal Government.

Thus it will be seen that over a 25-year period the Capehart costs about \$2,100 less than the more expensive and larger appropriated fund house, despite the difference in interest rates.

The committee takes complete exception to the inference contained in the last paragraph of the preceding statement. Obviously more expensive and larger appropriated fund houses do cost more than smaller \$16,500 Capehart units; so would a \$50,000 or \$100,000 house. The above is an effective comparison of apples and oranges but completely omits what could be the true picture.

If one assumed an appropriated-fund unit built for the same cost as a \$17,500 Capehart unit (\$16,500 on-site and \$1,000 off-site), there would be a saving of about \$3,300 in interest and mortgage insurance costs (\$8,084 versus \$11,397), based on a rate of $3\frac{1}{4}$ percent for direct Treasury borrowing compared to $4\frac{1}{4}$ percent for a private mortgage loan. If the 50,000 Capehart units in the fiscal year 1959 military construction authorization bill were built at the same construction cost with appropriated funds, a total savings of about \$165 million would be possible.

Regardless of whether family housing is provided with appropriated funds or by Capehart housing, the full cost to the Government is appreciably greater than when quarters allowances are paid to personnel occupying local community housing. For example, the quarters allowances forfeited by occupants of Capehart housing are used to pay off the mortgage indebtedness over a 25-year term. However, the rental allowance does not cover the cost involved in operation and maintenance of the quarters nor the provision and replacement of furniture.

No comprehensive cost data are currently available applicable to operation and maintenance costs of Capehart housing for the Department of Defense as a whole. However, the Navy has found that operation and maintenance costs for its Capehart units amount to approximately \$80 per month. These costs include heat, electricity, gas, maintenance of grounds, garbage disposal, repairs, and other necessary utilities and services. On this basis, it is appropriate to estimate that operation and maintenance costs for Capehart housing for the Department of Defense as a whole would probably average approximately \$75 per month.

It is not anticipated that all Capehart housing will be fully furnished with Government-owned furniture. A substantial number of the

occupants own their furniture and will occupy unfurnished quarters. Those quarters which are furnished, however, will increase the monthly cost to the Government by about \$25 per month (assuming that the initial cost of furniture will be \$3,000 and it will last for 10 years). Therefore, the cost to the Government for Capehart housing will vary from \$158 per month for unfurnished quarters to \$183 per month for furnished quarters. Since the average rental allowance is \$90 per month, unfurnished Capehart housing costs the Government \$68 per month additional, while furnished Capehart housing costs the Government \$93 per month additional. Over the 25-year period of amortizing the mortgage on Capehart housing, these additional costs amount to \$20,400 per unfurnished unit and \$27,900 per furnished unit.

If comparable priced Capehart and appropriated fund housing costs are compared, it is quite obvious that the appropriated fund is less expensive even if one assumes that the Government will pay interest for the appropriated fund units. However, such would not necessarily have to be the case especially in the year of a balanced budget.

COMMITTEE CONCLUSIONS ON MILITARY HOUSING

(1) Excluding special cases maximum dependence should be placed on community support (45 to 50 percent).

(2) Program needs to be reconciled with the long-range troop basis.

(3) Time-payment or credit-card method is too costly and should be changed.

(4) Military departments have a legitimate and significant need for a substantial number of new family housing units, but this need can be met more economically through appropriation of the necessary funds.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTIONS

In view of the foregoing, the committee has agreed to recommend that a certain number of military family housing units be included in the bill. However, it has rewritten certain portions of the authorization language in order to insure a better program. The bill as reported from the committee is designed to accomplish the actions incident to the following recommendations:

(1) The number of units to be constructed at a given installation shall not exceed 55 percent of the permanent long-range requirements (unless the Secretary of Defense shall certify that the installation concerned is isolated, or that housing is needed to meet unusual military conditions).

(2) In no case shall the total to be constructed under the fiscal year 1959 authorization exceed 30,000 units.

(3) The Secretary of Defense shall certify to the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate prior to advertising for bid, that the number of title VIII housing units to be constructed at a given location is consistent with the long-range troop basis and the above-mentioned 55-percent factor.

WHERRY HOUSING

The Wherry Act was originally conceived as a method of providing housing units by private financing. About 82,000 units were con-

structed during the effective life of the act (August 8, 1949 to June 30, 1956).

Based on a certification by the Secretary of Defense that the housing was needed, the FHA insured the mortgages. These unit mortgages averaged \$8,100, or 90 percent, of the average unit cost limitation of \$9,000. The mortgages are designed to amortize over a period of about 33 years at 4-percent interest.

In general, Wherry housing projects were built on land leased to a private sponsor by the Government for a 75-year period, at the end of which the Government obtains title.

Rental levels are established by the FHA predicated on estimates of the ability of military personnel to pay. Military personnel occupying such units do not surrender their rental allowances as is normally the case, nor is it mandatory that they occupy these units as is the case with those constructed with appropriated funds.

The present value of the 82,000 Wherry units located on Government-leased land is estimated in excess of \$1 billion.

Recognizing that Wherry units would be in existence at military installations for perhaps the next 60 to 70 years and that in many instances it would be desirable for the military departments to purchase them, Congress enacted permissive acquisition legislation in 1955. In 1956, by Public Law 1020, 84th Congress, it was made mandatory for the Defense Establishment to purchase Wherry projects at locations where Capehart units were to be constructed. To date, 14 Wherry projects representing 7,937 units have been acquired, or are in the process of acquisition.

Wherry acquisition

Of the total of 83,718 units in the Department of Defense Wherry program, acquisitions to May 9, 1958, total 37,776 units, divided as follows:

	<i>Units</i>
Army.....	9, 990
Navy.....	1, 073
Air Force.....	26, 733

In addition to the above, 9,064 units (2,819 Army and 6,245 Navy) are scheduled for acquisition prior to June 30, 1958. Of the June 30 cumulative total of almost 47,000 units, about 26,000 were mandatory, the balance permissive.

At present, acquisitions subsequent to fiscal year 1958 are scheduled for about 18,000 units, including the 9,374 permissive Air Force units proposed in this bill. This leaves about 19,000 units for which no acquisition is presently contemplated, because there is no specific requirement or need for acquisition at this time.

Wherry taxation

The taxation of unacquired Wherry projects by local taxing authorities is causing considerable concern. Section 511 of Public Law 1020, 84th Congress, provides that taxes on such projects shall not exceed the amount of taxes on other similar property of similar value, and further provides that the taxes shall be reduced by the amount of Federal payments to local authorities for school aid, plus the amounts expended by the Federal Government or the owner for services and facilities customarily rendered by the local taxing authority.

Authority to determine the amounts to be deducted has been delegated to the Secretaries of the three military departments. Determinations have been made in many cases, but their acceptance by local tax authorities is by no means general or uniform. In some cases, perhaps a third of those made to date, the tax deduction is accepted, and the case is then settled. In the remaining cases the local tax authorities either refuse to acknowledge the tax deduction at all, in effect questioning its constitutionality, or while accepting the principle, find points of disagreement on the amounts involved.

As a result Defense now faces an increasing number of cases where litigation will indefinitely postpone the orderly resolution of tax problems and the closely associated rent increase problems. In this atmosphere Defense says it must decide whether to:

(a) Allow rent increases to cover (and hold in escrow) the full amount of the tax, which would work an unjustified hardship on the occupants, or

(b) Allow rent increases to cover (and hold in escrow) the amount of the net tax after deductions, which would result in a loss by the Wherry sponsor in the event of an unfavorable court decision.

Furthermore, the burden of litigation and its cost fall on the mortgagor and the mortgagee who, quite naturally, are then tempted to follow the simpler course of yielding to the full local tax and increasing the rental payments accordingly.

Because of the wide variety of complications which have arisen in these cases, Defense has directed a survey of all Wherry tax problems in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the present program and to determine whether additional legislative authority is required.

Because of the previously mentioned line-item requirement, the bill as presented requested authority for permissive acquisition of approximately 11,000 Wherry units not covered by the mandatory provisions of law. Subsequent to the submission of the proposed legislation to Congress, the Department of Defense forwarded certain additional requests for line-item authorization for permissive acquisition at certain installations where special conditions made it seem desirable for the Government to obtain ownership.

Recognizing that the acquisition of these projects is consistent with previous legislation proposed by the committee and passed by the Congress, this bill would provide the Secretary of Defense with permissive authority to acquire any Wherry project for which he deems there is a long-range military requirement.

In addition, the committee has included an amendment to the Housing Amendments of 1955, designed to clarify and stabilize the procedures for acquiring Wherry housing projects by condemnation. The committee takes this action primarily because it has been informed, and has a sound basis to believe correctly, that the criteria utilized in the acquisition of Wherry projects has varied from service to service with a resultant lack of acceptable uniformity. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense, who should now have no doubt about his authority, to establish a standard procedure which, in the interest of clarity, just compensation, and equitable treatment of all concerned, will be followed by the entire Department.

SUBSTANDARD QUARTERS

It will be remembered that last year's act authorized military departments to declare certain substandard units as inadequate and that by doing so it would be possible for the department to charge a rent rather than forfeit a full quarters allowance, and that this rent would be more consistent with the real value of the property. A time limitation was placed on the duration of this legislation; at the end of that time (July 1960) all substandard units which had not been repaired or altered to bring them up to standard are to be disposed of. The Senate committee agreed to this cutoff date in conference. The committee, however, indicated in its report that in the interest of economy it was not realistic to assume that the services would be allowed the necessary funds required to improve all substandard quarters in the immediate future, and that it certainly would be impracticable to permit the destruction or removal of usable units especially if no other housing were available. It also indicated that it expected the service Secretaries to report annually, in conjunction with the submission of the military construction bill, the number of units declared substandard during the preceding year, the criteria utilized, the reason for such actions, the progress being made in eliminating units from the substandard list, and the cost involved.

To date, the committee has not received a satisfactory report. During the hearings it requested specific information pertaining to the number declared substandard. The information received was to the effect that the Department could not provide specific data, but that it anticipated that 20,000 units might need to be destroyed. The committee notes line item justification data presented in support for new housing projects that part of the justification was predicated on the fact "that there exists at this installation a specific number of substandard units which must be destroyed or disposed of by July 1960." Obviously these substandard units were not computed as assets in estimating the overall need for additional construction. It is equally obvious that the committee does not expect the Defense Department to house people in really inadequate quarters. Nevertheless it feels that this program has not been sufficiently analyzed to date and, therefore, section 506 of this bill would provide for a 2-year extension of the previously mentioned terminal date.

OVERSEAS BASES

This bill would authorize nearly \$250 million for the construction of various overseas bases. There are approximately 280 major overseas bases utilized by our military forces throughout the world. This number does not include certain small and isolated stations. As of June 30, 1957, 41 percent of our armed services were stationed either abroad or with the operating forces of the Navy, afloat or mobile.

As of January 1958, these figures were as follows:

Total in the active forces.....	2, 600, 000
Stationed abroad.....	710, 000
Navy forces afloat or mobile.....	364, 000
Percentage abroad and afloat.....	40. 3

The magnitude of our overseas effort can begin to be understood when it is realized that the bases covered in this bill alone represent the following dollar figures in construction authorizations only:

Authorization in inventory as of June 30, 1958-----	\$3, 079, 013, 000
Authorization not yet in inventory-----	1, 498, 242, 000
Requested authorization contained in this bill-----	222, 081, 000
Estimated future authorization requirements-----	2, 126, 630, 000
Total-----	6, 925, 966, 000

The committee requested that the Defense Department furnish the above figures for all overseas bases, but because of the amount of bookkeeping involved it was impossible to provide the information in time to be included in this report. The committee will expect these figures to be furnished in connection with the submission of next year's (fiscal year 1960) military construction authorization bill.

While many specifics of overseas activities must of necessity remain classified, including precise strengths for given locations, one national publication recently showed our overseas effort, in terms of personnel, as follows:

Area	Military	Dependent	Total
Far East-----	205, 000	92, 000	297, 000
Alaska-----	41, 000	36, 000	77, 000
Hawaii-----	41, 000	58, 000	99, 000
Caribbean-----	23, 000	39, 000	62, 000
North Africa-----	18, 000	11, 000	29, 000
Europe-----	353, 000	271, 000	624, 000
Total-----	681, 000	507, 000	1, 188, 000

These figures are obviously not completely accurate, but they are sufficient to show the order of magnitude. In fact the trend is apparently toward increasing overseas costs and personnel strengths even though in many instances the military figures are decreasing. For example, the Department of Defense total of military and civilian personnel for overseas and foreign countries decreased during the 14-month period ending March 31, 1957, from approximately 690,000 to approximately 640,000. During this same time, however, the overseas dependent population increased from approximately 348,000 to approximately 409,000.

The salary costs alone on the above figures (predicated on an average of \$5,000 a year per military individual and \$6,000 a year per civilian) create an annual payroll of nearly \$3.5 billion. These salary figures obviously do not include the cost of the needed logistical support which is tremendous. This logistical support consists of indigenous civilian employees, ship and airlift tonnage, schools, commissaries, medical facilities, and other items, all of which constitute a substantial outflow of cash.

ADDITIONAL FACTS ABOUT UNITED STATES OVERSEAS EFFORT

In addition to the employees of the armed services both military and civilian, the United States Government maintains close to 200,000 full-time employees abroad. These employees are accompanied by better than 100,000 dependents.

The United States Military Sea Transportation Service in support of our overseas effort operates the world's largest fleet of passenger vessels; nearly 550 ships call at nearly 550 ports. During 1 calendar year these MSTS ships carried nearly 250,000 tons of household effects.

The Military Air Transport Service, 1 year, transported close to 60,000 United States civilians and dependents from this country to their overseas destinations (this does not count almost \$400 million of Government moneys used to charter privately owned transportation space during the same period).

During one fiscal year nearly 40,000 shipments of personal effects were dispatched out of a single east coast port. It is estimated that it costs approximately \$10,000 to move an average family overseas.

In many overseas areas our installations have become self-sufficient and almost isolated local American communities, completely equipped with their own clubs, shopping centers, theaters, hotels, and transportation service.

While it has often been said that our personnel overseas represent our "best ambassadors," the committee cannot help but wonder if this isolation of American installations does not in fact occasion at times more resentment than it does a friendly attitude.

Here the committee would like to address itself to the overseas family housing in the bill. They are mostly to be constructed under the provisions of the surplus commodity program. The committee recommends approval of most units requested because it realizes that our personnel must be adequately housed and too, it favors the surplus commodity method of constructing overseas facilities. The committee calls upon the Secretary of Defense to exercise his authority to authorize the construction of the minimum amount needed to meet military operational requirements only. The committee cannot help but feel that wherever possible the United States personnel should attempt to become more a part of the local communities. It has received many letters on this subject from without the United States. Certain portions of one letter deemed pertinent are quoted below:

CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE ARMED FORCES COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: * * * on stepping off the plane, Captain Smith, who had never seen our village said "this is our town," and he proceeded to organize mail, express, freight, and * * * to stress public relations. At that time we understood it was the policy of the United States to have their people to mix as much as possible in the community. Since that time relations have been excellent. Housing is scarce in town, but local people have provided houses and sites to families who now live here. The United States military personnel have become part of our community. We provide schools for the base children and the problem of bus transportation for the children out of town is something to consider also. Completely modern medical, dental, and hospital facilities is also provided—and used almost exclusively by the base. Civilian personnel working in the base nearly all live

in town. Our churches are pleased to have quite a number attending from the base, and the base chaplain on his regular visits has been holding evening services in our town. In general, the United States military force has taken part in most of our local activities with a very friendly spirit prevailing. We feel that these friendly relations would be seriously jeopardized by isolating the personnel families away from town. * * *

Yours truly,

COMMITTEE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee is pleased to note that the requests for overseas construction in this bill are generally on an austere basis and give evidence of very thorough prior review. Nevertheless, the committee calls upon the Secretary of Defense to exercise now and in the future continued and greater vigilance to insure that overseas construction is kept to a minimum and is consistent with approved military policies, and that the stationing of dependents in areas of potential combat be seriously questioned.

The committee desires this review and close supervision because if constant vigilance is not maintained, the following unacceptable conditions could result:

(1) Individuals and units stationed overseas could become so engrossed in their own daily "housekeeping" that they do serious damage to their military mission.

(2) Unacceptable immobility due to the ratio of noncombatants to combat troops. Large and vulnerable numbers of dependents stationed in potential theaters of combat might well introduce personal considerations into the minds of those who should be solely preoccupied with military operations.

(NOTE.—At one Air Force installation within easy reach of potential enemy missiles, approximately 82 percent of the officers and 46 percent of the airmen are accompanied by their families. There are 3,200 high school and elementary students attending base schools—and this in an area where mobility is said to be one of the prime methods of defending the base—if "defense" is the proper word).

(3) The cost of maintaining and providing logistical support for overseas installations could exceed their military value.

REAL ESTATE

The inventory report on real property owned by the United States throughout the world, dated June 30, 1957, prepared by the General Services Administration, shows that Interior has control over 211.2 million acres of Government-owned land in the United States; Agriculture has control over 167.5 million acres of Government-owned land in the United States; and Defense has control over 27.3 million acres.

The real property under military control includes property owned, leased, used by permit, easement, and various occupancy rights (foreign base agreements). As of June 30, 1957, the military departments controlled approximately 35 million acres of land throughout

the world. This land, together with the improvements, had an original cost to the United States of \$24.8 billion.

The real estate under military control may be grouped as follows: 27.3 million acres in the United States, together with improvements thereon, having an original cost of \$19.5 billion; 5 million acres in the Territories and possessions, together with the improvements thereon, having an original cost of \$2.6 billion; and 2.7 million acres in foreign countries, together with the improvements thereon, having an original cost of \$2.7 billion.

The real-property acreage under military control in the United States consists of the following:

	<i>Acres</i>
Fee owned.....	7, 669, 150
Public domain.....	15, 067, 168
Temporary use.....	2, 824, 670
Leased.....	1, 722, 558
Easements.....	67, 408
Total.....	27, 350, 954

Attention is invited to the fact that over half of the land under military control is public-domain land that has never been on the tax rolls. Only 7,669,150 acres of land under military control have been removed from the tax rolls in the United States.

The 27.3 million acres under military control in the United States is approximately 1.4 percent of the total land area in the United States. The United States Government owns 408.5 million acres of land in the United States, or 21.5 percent of the total land area in the United States.

The Department of Defense is continuing its efforts to dispose of the maximum practicable amount of real property, and, during the period August 27, 1955, to April 1, 1958, a total of 469 installations, or portions thereof, consisting of 1,841,076 acres of land, representing an acquisition cost of \$707,910,000, were determined to be excess within the meaning of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended. Altogether, the property so determined, and that which currently is being examined within the Department of Defense, consists of 6,077,501 acres of land on 717 separate installations, which represents an acquisition cost of \$1,756,932,000.

Since Korea, the authorization for land acquisition has been decreasing each year in both dollars and acres. The acreage and cost of property determined excess to military needs has been increasing each year. During the period April 1 to July 10, 1958, 68,982 acres of land, together with improvements thereon, having an original cost of \$100,066,076, have been determined to be excess to the needs of the Department of Defense within the meaning of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended. In addition to the foregoing, 2 Air Force ranges, having a total of 964,565 acres of land, will be declared excess to the requirements of the Department of Defense within the near future.

New weapons systems continue to be the principal user of additional acreage being added to our inventory. However, the use of existing bases for such sites, wherever available, and the use of existing bases for support facilities, kept new acquisition to a minimum and reduced the cost of constructing support facilities. Some examples of this practice are the use of Camp Cooke, Calif., as a joint missile facility

and the use of Francis E. Warren Air Force Base in Wyoming as a support location for an ICBM site.

A summary of the real-estate acquisitions proposed in titles I, II, and III of the bill is shown in the following tabulation:

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Fee acquisition (acres)	Fee cost	Easement acquisition (acres)	Easement cost	Total cost
Army.....	3,952.89	\$5,957.0	7,845.00	\$4,290.0	\$10,247.0
Navy.....	1,337.00	2,008.0	399.00	164.0	2,172.0
Air Force.....	2,078.41	1,362.5	3,400.49	289.3	1,651.8
Total.....	7,368.30	9,327.5	11,644.49	4,743.3	14,070.8

NOTE.—Land in addition to that shown above will be required for aircraft control and warning, ballistic missiles, and strategic missiles at various locations where the exact acreage and cost have not yet been established.

Although the committee acknowledges the Department's efforts toward the disposal of surplus real estate, it is, frankly, disappointed in the results attained so far. In consideration of the fact that over 27 million acres in the United States alone are controlled by the military departments, the Defense Establishment is under the most serious obligation to husband its resources and to return to the tax rolls all real-estate holdings surplus to strict military requirements. The committee notes, further, the failure of the Department of Defense to include legislative provisions, as promised last year, which would permit the sale of military installations in high-priced urban areas and authorize the use of sale proceeds toward the reconstitution of facilities elsewhere at an overall saving to the Government.

WASHINGTON AIRSPACE PROBLEM

For some time the committee has been gravely concerned over the problems arising from the multiple utilization of airspace by military and civilian aircraft. It is obvious that the airspace problem in Washington is becoming more and more acute—even as it is in many other parts of the country. The committee feels strongly that Congress can no longer approve the establishment or expansion of military air facilities in heavily populated centers without covering thoroughly the airspace problem.

This bill includes two items for:

The Navy in the amount of approximately \$18 million, and \$20 million for the Air Force. These authorizations would be utilized in the expansion of Andrews Air Force Base and the John Tower air facility located at Andrews.

Testimony given by Navy and Air Force witnesses concerning their plans to move air operations from Bolling and Anacostia indicated that they propose to move as soon as the construction of adequate facilities at Andrews are completed. One witness indicated that such a move might be as late as the first quarter of the calendar year 1963 before Bolling and the MATS terminal at National Airport would cease to be used. The earliest possible date mentioned in the testimony was some time late in 1960. The committee cannot help but feel that this is not early enough.

It is understandable that the services have many military requirements relative to the operation of aircraft in the Washington area;

but regardless of these requirements, the committee cannot help but conclude that some additional vigorous and prompt action must be taken immediately to ease the situation—even if it means that, on a temporary basis, substitute solutions are accepted.

In 1957, there were 280,000 flights from the National Airport, of which 7,700 were MATS aircraft. At Bolling there were 42,000; at Anacostia, 72,000. Andrews is also a busy airport with 222,000. This makes a total of around 626,000 aircraft operations in the Washington area annually, of which, if these figures taken from the testimony are correct, only a little better than 270,000 were civilian. These figures sound fantastically high, but they are taken directly from testimony so it is assumed that they are correct.

At the committee's request, Gen. E. R. Quesada, Special Assistant to the President, Chairman of the Airways Modernization Board, and Chairman of the Air Coordinating Committee, appeared before the committee. The committee found General Quesada highly informed on the subject and most cooperative. The committee suggested to General Quesada that it wanted not only a solution for the interim period but also a permanent one predicated on long-range planning. He was asked to confer with the services involved and review the possibility of immediately moving certain of the proficiency and other military flying operations from the Washington area to outlying areas, even if such required conditions which would not be considered satisfactory to meet all military requirements over a long period of time.

As a result of General Quesada's investigation, he wrote the committee a letter on June 16, 1958 (a full copy of this letter will be found at the appendix of the printed testimony), salient features of which are printed below:

Your committee's desires for early action prompted me to explore in some detail two logical possibilities:

First—what action can be taken now, this week, to alleviate the congestion, and improve the air traffic safety features, and

Second—what interim steps can be taken between now and the time an expanded Andrews facility can accept additional aircraft.

In the first instance, I would like to list for the committee's information action on the part of the Air Force and the Navy at Bolling and Anacostia that will be taken immediately to reduce the volume of operations at those bases. This action is a direct result of your committee's request for the study.

1. An agreement between Anacostia, Bolling, and Washington National towers to separate the traffic from those bases has been amended as of June 10. The amended agreement further confines military VFR traffic operating to and from Bolling and Anacostia to two definitely prescribed corridors or tunnels from which they may not deviate. These tunnels will keep Bolling and Anacostia aircraft east of the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers and will prevent them from mixing with aircraft operations at Washington National Airport. I would like to insert a copy of the amended agreement for the record.

2. Both bases are completely closed to jet aircraft and the six jets previously stationed at Anacostia are now grounded, and will be transferred to Andrews.

3. All transient aircraft at Bolling and Anacostia will be restricted to official business only.

4. Flights emanating from Bolling and Anacostia will leave the vicinity of Bolling-Anacostia until the flight is to be terminated.

5. Bolling and Anacostia pilots will make increased use of instrument flight plans to the extent that they can be accommodated by the air traffic control system.

6. All reserve squadrons at Anacostia will be scheduled to perform their yearly 2 weeks of active training duty at other bases throughout the country where less air traffic congestion exists and not at Anacostia. There are no Air Force reserve squadrons based at Bolling.

It is anticipated that the above actions and restrictions will reduce the annual operations at Bolling and Anacostia by about 26,000 movements, or by about 25 percent.

My investigation into the possible immediate transfer of aircraft from Bolling and Anacostia to other military bases until Andrews is ready led me to two basic considerations. First, it was necessary to find military bases within 200 miles of Washington which could accept and support additional piston aircraft of the types now based at Bolling and Anacostia. Second, we had to explore the impact the remote location of aircraft would have upon the complicated scheduling of pilots, aircraft, and missions.

To physically accept additional aircraft, a remote base must have adequate runway, ramp, and parking space. The base would have to be so located that the introduction of additional operations would not aggravate an already congested airspace and air traffic-control situation.

Before transferring Bolling and Anacostia aircraft, provision must be made for transfer and housing of maintenance and other support personnel, for storing and testing spare engines, radios, and various other aircraft components.

* * * * *

On the basis of data I have been able to develop in the preparation of this report for your committee, I recommend:

1. Expedited action to immediately enlarge the ground, navigation, communications, and landing facilities at Andrews Air Force Base and Patuxent River Naval Air Station. This action is absolutely essential to realizing the maximum safe utilization of the airspace and airports in the National Capital region.

2. The expansion at Andrews be so staged that homogeneous units of Bolling and Anacostia aircraft can transfer to Andrews at the completion of each specific stage.

3. That any increase in the civil air traffic into the Washington National Airport be carefully reviewed until such time as this air-traffic congestion has been alleviated by the completion of the airport now planned at Chantilly. For example initial operations of commercial jets serving the

Washington area will be operated from Friendship Airport near Baltimore until adequate facilities are available at Chantilly.

4. Continued effort on the part of the Navy, the Air Force, and civil operators to explore ways and means to further reduce the number of aircraft operations at Bolling Anacostia, and National Airport.

The committee wishes to compliment and thank General Quesada for his assistance. It cannot help but feel, however, that it is incumbent upon the services to continue to pursue the subject most vigorously—even if it means drastically curtailing proficiency flights in areas where civilian aircraft must operate. It becomes increasingly obvious that a solution must soon be found to the airspace congestion which has resulted in so many tragic fatalities in the past few months. The committee cannot help but feel that many of these tragedies could have been avoided. The committee includes these remarks in this report on the construction bill in order to emphasize the problem and to indicate that it expects the Secretary of Defense to move with all possible speed in expediting the construction of facilities at Andrews Air Force Base and also to insure that the establishment of other military facilities throughout the country is coordinated in light of the airspace problem.

COMPETITIVE BID PROCEDURES AND CONTRACT SUPERVISION

The committee has always been of the firm conviction that construction contracts should on the main be let under established and time proven competitive bid procedures. This is the only adequate way to insure that the Government gets the most value for the dollar spent.

During the hearings, Department of Defense was requested to submit information indicating past experiences in this area. Information received is shown below:

Comparative percentage of competitive bid contracts versus negotiated contracts for all Department of Defense military construction during the past 5½ years

	Percentage of work performed by—	
	Competitive-bid contracts	Negotiated contracts
Fiscal year:		
1953.....	93	7
1954.....	93	7
1955.....	80	1 20
1956.....	91	9
1957.....	91	9
1st half, 1958.....	94	6

¹ This high percentage is mainly due to the DEW line construction contracts.

The committee is pleased to note that the experience in the construction field indicates that better than 90 percent of all contracts have been let on a competitive-bid basis; however, it feels that improvements can still be made. It recognizes, of course, that under certain classified conditions and at special overseas locations it may be

necessary to resort to negotiated contracts. There is a grave danger, however, that negotiated procedures may result in excessive costs and inefficiency especially when adequate supervision by qualified military and civilian engineers representing the Government is not constantly maintained. The committee particularly views with alarm the growing trend to let huge contracts for the construction of missile facilities on a negotiated basis. The use of package-type contracts for design and construction activities with industrial manufacturers could well result in the following:

(a) Large sums of appropriated funds controlled and expended as the contractor sees fit.

(b) Excessive concentration of vast sums of money in the hands of a single contractor.

(c) Inadequate or no supervision of the design and construction by qualified representatives of the Government.

(d) Competition between two or more military services for resources, materials, equipment, and personnel.

In view of the foregoing, section 506 of this bill repeats the language contained in previous construction bills to the effect that insofar as possible, contracts under this act should be awarded on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder. In addition, section 506 provides that contracts which shall be executed by the United States under this act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and the supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense, in special cases determines otherwise.

HOSPITALS AND DEPENDENT MEDICAL CARE

There was originally requested in this bill authority to construct nine hospitals listed as follows:

For the Army

A 50/100-bed hospital at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., in the amount of \$1,900,000; and

A 125/200-bed hospital at Fort McClellan, Ala., in the amount of \$3,331,000.

For the Navy

No hospitals were requested; however, \$8,503,000 was requested to provide for replacement of inadequate or temporary facilities and for certain new ones at the Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md.

For the Air Force

Seven small 50-bed hospitals totaling \$16,137,000 at Air Force bases which do not now have hospitals.

The installations are:

Glasgow Air Force Base, Mont.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak.

Kinross Air Force Base, Mich.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich.

Beale Air Force Base, Calif.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wis.

The committee has for some time been quite concerned, not over the services' requirement for proper medical facilities, but over the maximum utilization of those already in being. This aspect has been emphasized most recently by the results accumulated to date in the implementation of title II of the Dependents Medical Care Act (Public Law 569, 84th Cong.).

Title II of the above-referenced act provides in part that in order to assure the availability of medical care for certain dependents of members of the uniformed services, the Secretary of Defense should prescribe procedures for providing medical service or health plans as deemed appropriate. Despite a sizable reduction in personnel strength since enactment of the law, the cost for dependent medical care for fiscal year 1958 has grown to over \$75 million and for 1959 it is estimated that it will be approximately \$70 million. Apparently one of the main reasons for these high costs has been the failure of the Department of Defense to require that existing military medical facilities, where adequate and available, be used for the treatment of dependents.

A comparison of the cost per patient-day for each of the three services and for the Dependents Medical Care Act during fiscal year 1957, is shown below:

<i>Cost per patient-day for fiscal year 1957</i>	
Navy.....	\$16. 24
Army.....	26. 42
Air Force.....	24. 64
Dependents Medical Care Act.....	45. 00

Of course, these costs are averages and the DMCA cost is an estimate. While these figures are not fully comparable, because the DMCA figures do not include administrative charges or fees paid by dependents nor does the Government experience all of the cost incurred by private medical facilities. Nevertheless, they do represent out-of-pocket costs to the Government for the cost per patient-day in medical facilities both private and military.

DMCA cost has risen to \$50 a day since 1957, while it has been stated that service costs per patient-day have remained approximately the same.

USE OF EXISTING MEDICAL FACILITIES

It appears obvious to the committee that existing medical facilities are not being utilized to the extent of their capacity. At the beginning of calendar 1958, the committee has been informed, the normal bed capacity of the medical facilities of the three services was approximately 85,000. Approximately 42,000 of this number represents the operating beds and the daily average of beds occupied was less than 31,000. Dependents occupied less than 6,000 of this 31,000 figure. In fact, during the first year of the operation of DMCA, beds occupied by dependents in military medical facilities decreased by approximately 1,000.

COMMITTEE ACTION

In light of the foregoing, the committee does not at this time recommend additional authorization for the construction of hospital facilities to replace those already in existence. It realizes that there exists within the services many medical installations which must ultimately be replaced and modernized. However, it has adopted the policy of disapproving, at least for this year, replacement of such facilities until it is convinced that maximum utilization is being accomplished at existing facilities.

The committee has therefore deleted from the "Army" title of the bill the 2 hospitals previously mentioned—one at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., and one at Fort McClellan, Ala. It recommends approval for the Navy and Air Force items only because the Navy item is basically for the expansion of the Medical Center at Bethesda, a national institution, and because the small 50-bed hospitals carried in the "Air Force" title are for installations which do not now have hospital facilities.

In taking this action, the committee calls upon the Secretary of Defense to furnish at an early date a tabular report, showing full figures pertaining to the number of dependents cared for during the 2 calendar years preceding the effective date of the Dependents Medical Care Act and relative subsequent data.

RESERVE COMPONENT FACILITIES

Last year when reporting on the hearings which preceded the enactment of Public Law 85-215, providing authorizations for construction of Reserve-component facilities, the committee indicated its desire that in subsequent legislation of this type the Department of Defense should request annual authorizations on a line-item basis. Therefore, shortly after the submission of S. 3756 to Congress (the fiscal year 1959 military construction authorization bill pertaining to the active services), the Department of Defense submitted S. 3863, proposing certain line authorizations for construction pertaining to the Reserve components.

It appeared logical to the committee that both Active and Reserve construction programs be combined in one bill; therefore, while testimony was taken on S. 3863, its provisions as recommended by the committee have been included under title VI of this bill.

As originally presented, S. 3863 contained authorization requests amounting to approximately \$30 million broken down as follows:

Navy and Marine Corps.....	\$11, 892, 000
Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard.....	18, 248, 000

No additional authorizations were requested for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve. The Department of Defense indicated no additional authorities were requested for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve because there existed a carryover into fiscal year 1959 from prior-year authorizations in an amount of approximately \$45 million. The inference was that this \$45 million was considered adequate to provide construction for the next 12 months.

The committee takes exception to this philosophy. It considers

the National Guard and the Organized Reserve as absolutely essential to this Nation's defense, and it firmly believes that our Reserve components must be provided with adequate armories and the other facilities needed for their training.

Testimony taken last year indicated that there were better than 2,000 locations where Army Reserve training was being carried on and that of these only 551 were considered adequate. In the case of the Army National Guard it was stated that out of a total requirement for 2,700 units, there remained 800 locations to be established or improved, and yet S. 3863 contained no request for additional Army installations. This is surprising in view of the fact that the committee was informed that various States and communities have already made available approximately \$35 million as their contribution, and if the Federal Government were to provide its 75 percent share there would need to be almost \$100 million more made available.

Various charts presented during the hearings indicated that the total amount of authorizations requested represented only 2.6 percent of the total requirement. If this percentage is added to that already in being or under contract, there remains 46.9 percent to be filled. At this rate it would take nearly 15 years to provide the estimated requirements for all Reserve components.

Testimony from senior National Guard officials indicated "a dire need for many new National Guard armories."

At the committee's request the National Guard Bureau submitted a list of various projects in accord with requests and priorities established by the adjutants general of the States involved, with State-matching funds and sites already available. It was indicated to the committee that these projects, both armory and nonarmory, had been reviewed for compliance with Department of Defense criteria and a continuing requirement under the new forces structure of the Army National Guard, and all are considered to be essential and eligible for Federal participation.

As a result of the foregoing, the committee added line-item projects for the Army National Guard in the amount of approximately \$23 million and for the Army Reserve approximately \$5 million.

During the course of the hearings, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations, by letter dated June 18, 1958, furnished the committee a list of projects for each Reserve component showing them by location, type, and indicating those for which the existing authorizations would carry over into fiscal year 1959 (this list appears in the printed hearings, beginning on p. 836). In taking the action to add the line item projects for the Army National Guard and for the Army Reserve mentioned previously, the committee wishes to make completely clear that this additional authorization would be in addition to projects heretofore approved and to those covered in the carry-over list conveyed by Secretary Bryant's letter of June 18, 1958. These authorizations are not intended as a priority but rather as a supplement to the previously mentioned list.

Secretary Bryant's letter of June 18, and that portion of the carry-over list pertaining to the Army National Guard is appended to this report.

Further description of title VI is contained in a subsequent portion of this report along with a geographical listing by States.

SAN JACINTO ORDNANCE DEPOT, TEX.

As indicated in previous reports accompanying prior-year military-construction-authorization bills, the committee has for some time been concerned over the specific location of certain types of military facilities, especially those constituting a potential danger to the local communities incident to the storage of huge quantities of explosives and other munitions. Equally of concern to the committee is the retention of facilities at the expense of the local economy when the original military requirement for their existence may have been substantially altered or eliminated by changes in the concept and technology of modern warfare.

The San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, as well as the naval facility at Port Chicago, Calif., has been the subject of review by the committee over the past several years. Recently the committee has received many letters and telegrams challenging the need for the San Jacinto Depot. The committee notes the action by the House of Representatives in its passage of the fiscal year 1959 military-construction-authorization bill, wherein the language contained in section 109 of title I would require the sale of San Jacinto by the Secretary of the Army. The Senate committee feels that a sale must be considered only in light of security requirements. It does believe, however, that serious question has arisen as to the actual need for this facility at its present location and whether it would be advisable to move it to an alternate site. Therefore, language has been included in section 110 authorizing and directing the sale of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, unless the Secretary of Defense finds after due investigation that such action would be inimical to the national security.

In taking this action, the committee invites the attention of the Secretary of Defense to the need to resurvey other like installations where similar conditions may exist. The committee especially wants to emphasize the Port Chicago Facility as being in this category. In the past the committee has been urged to authorize the relocation of Port Chicago. The committee has taken no action because of firm representation by the Department of Defense that the existence of the Port Chicago Facility at its present location is essential to national security and that no satisfactory alternate site has been found on the Pacific coast.

The committee calls upon the Secretary of Defense to again review this matter and report the results of such review to the Committees on Armed Services no later than February 1, 1959.

TITLE I—ARMY

BRIEF OF NEW AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

Title I (Army):

Inside continental United States.....	\$104,325,000
Outside continental United States.....	8,732,000
Classified.....	63,906,000
Emergency construction.....	25,000,000
Total.....	201,963,000

The Army structure in support of which the construction program is designed is summarized by major combat units as follows:

Army structure—Major combat units

	Fiscal year 1958	Fiscal year 1959
End of year strength.....	900,000	870,000
Divisions.....	15	14
Armored Combat Command.....	1	1
Brigades, battle groups, and regiments.....	11	11
Missile commands.....	4	4
Total surface-to-surface missile units ¹	29 (9)	35 (7)
Surface-to-air missile battalions.....	65	74
Aviation companies.....	25	30
Aviation helicopter companies.....	21	24
Aviation cargo companies.....	4	6

¹ Numbers in parenthesis represent units included in missile commands listed above.

The Army's comparative personnel strengths showing officers, enlisted, and cadets are as follows:

Military personnel strengths—Army

[Thousands]

	Actual strength		Projected strength				
	June 30, 1957	Dec. 31, 1957	June 30, 1958		June 30, 1959	Average strength	
			Original fiscal year 1958 esti- mate	Current estimate		Fiscal year 1958	Fiscal year 1959
Officers.....	110.6	104.7	110.6	105.0	100.1	106.4	102.2
Enlisted.....	884.7	810.2	887.4	793.1	768.0	830.1	773.8
Subtotal.....	995.3	914.9	998.0	898.1	868.1	936.5	876.0
Cadets.....	1.8	2.4	2.0	1.9	1.9	2.4	2.4
Total.....	997.1	917.3	1,000.0	900.0	870.0	938.9	878.4

A summation of the fiscal year 1959 military construction authorization requests as originally presented to the committee follows:

Summary of program objectives contained in title I (Army)

	Amount	Percent
For construction of Nike, Hawk, and Missile Master facilities in both continental United States and overseas areas.....	\$137,215,000	¹ 39.5
For troop housing in the continental United States and overseas areas, including \$29,000,000 for permanent barracks, messes, and administration and supply buildings, to accommodate 10,768 enlisted men, and \$3,200,000 for permanent BOQ spaces to accommodate 372 officers. The remaining \$6,400,000 will provide 3,644 semipermanent barracks spaces and 663 BOQ spaces at temporary installations in the continental United States and in overseas areas.....	38,640,000	11.1
For construction of facilities in support of classified projects in overseas areas.....	31,280,000	9.0
For classified facilities in support of the Nike-Zeus program in the continental United States and in overseas areas.....	29,195,000	8.4
For construction of necessary facilities required by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules.....	25,000,000	7.2
For the construction of training facilities, to include \$3,400,000 for an academic building at Fort Lee, Va.; \$2,300,000 for an academic building at Fort Sill, Okla.; and \$7,900,000 for classroom and laboratory buildings at Fort Bliss, Tex.....	17,481,000	5.0
For fee acquisition of 551 acres at 3 named installations, and fee acquisition of 3,402 acres and easement over 7,845 acres at various Nike and other antiaircraft installations.....	10,247,000	3.0
For research, development and test facilities in the continental United States.....	9,931,000	2.9
For essential airfield and heliport facilities at major installations throughout the United States and in overseas areas to support the Army's aviation program.....	7,260,000	2.1
For the construction of hospital and medical facilities, to include \$1,900,000 for a 50/100 bed hospital at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., and \$3,300,000 for a 125/200 bed hospital at Fort McClellan, Ala.....	6,583,000	1.9
For the U. S. Military Academy, to provide a new cadet barracks building (526 spaces), alterations to the existing hospital, and modernization of facilities at Camp Buckner.....	5,844,000	1.7
For maintenance and storage facilities and miscellaneous support items along the line of communications in France.....	4,063,000	1.2
For community, welfare and morale facilities in the United States and in overseas areas to include commissaries, service clubs, NCO clubs, chapels, hobby shops, post exchanges, and libraries.....	3,431,000	1.0
For continuation of other essential programs to include administrative facilities; covered, open, and ammunition storage facilities; waterfront facilities; post engineer facilities; field maintenance shops; and utilities, to include electricity, water, heat, roads and streets, and ground improvements.....	20,849,000	6.0
Total.....	347,028,000	100.0

¹ Major changes in the above as a result of committee action are: (1) Deletion of the \$137,215,000 for construction of Nike, Hawk, and Missile Master facilities from title I (Army), and inclusion of the authority in title IV (Defense) as previously mentioned.

Categories of construction

A breakdown of the program by broad categories is as follows:

Analysis of title I (Army) by category type of facilities to be provided

(Dollar amounts in millions)

Categories	Zone of interior	Percent	Overseas	Percent	Total	Percent
1. Operational and training.....	\$127.0	36.6	\$40.2	11.6	\$167.2	48.2
2. Maintenance and production.....	12.1	3.5	.8	.2	12.9	3.7
3. Research, development, and test.....	19.7	5.7	19.4	5.6	39.1	11.3
4. Supply.....	.1		11.0	3.2	11.1	3.2
5. Hospital and medical.....	6.4	1.9	.1		6.5	1.9
6. Administrative.....	9.6	2.8	.1		9.7	2.8
7. Housing and community.....	42.9	12.4	4.5	1.3	47.4	13.7
8. Utilities and ground improvements.....	9.7	2.8	8.2	2.3	17.9	5.1
9. Real estate.....	7.2	2.1	3.0	.8	10.2	2.9
10. See. 103.....	25.0	7.2			25.0	7.2
Total.....	259.7	75.0	87.3	25.0	347.0	100.0

PROGRAM BY MAJOR ACTIVITIES

A description of the program by major activities and the missions to be served follow:

Technical services

Ordnance Corps.—The assigned mission of the Ordnance Corps, under the direction of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, is to support Army combat forces by the provision of all weapons, ammunition, combat vehicles, ordnance general supplies, and trained personnel to furnish specialized ordnance services of the types needed, when and where needed. This element of the program totals \$25,393,000 for construction at 5 installations, to include operational and training facilities, research, development and test facilities, administrative facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, representing 7.6 percent of the program.

Quartermaster Corps.—The Quartermaster General, under the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, develops, provides and services food, clothing, petroleum (except field and higher echelon maintenance of pipelines), aerial supply equipment, other quartermaster equipment, supplies, maintenance and services for the Army, and, as assigned, for the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps; provides for the disposal of Army surplus personal property, as assigned; and provides for the care and disposition of the remains and personal effects of deceased personnel of the Army and as directed or agreed upon, of the Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, and for general supervision of the operation of national cemeteries. Included in the program for the Quartermaster Corps is \$4,630,000 for construction at 1 installation to include operational and training facilities, and troop housing, representing 1.4 percent of the program.

Chemical Corps.—The mission of the Army Chemical Corps, under the direction and control of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, is to provide support to the Department of Defense (Army, Air Force, and Navy including the Marine Corps) in the fields of chemical, biological, and radiological (CBR) warfare, including smoke, flame, and incendiaries, and materiel and equipment. This mission carries with it a responsibility to assure that the Army achieves a realistic capability for operations in both offensive and defensive CBR warfare. This segment of the program totals \$2,846,000 for the construction of troop housing and utilities at 2 installations, representing 0.9 percent of the program.

Signal Corps.—The primary mission of the Signal Corps under the direction of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics is to provide communication and pictorial services for the United States Army, worldwide, and for other components of the Department of Defense as directed. The Signal Corps element of the program totals \$9,098,000 for construction of operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and utilities at 1 installation, representing 2.7 percent of the program.

Corps of Engineers.—The Corps of Engineers, a technical service and a combat arm, is the construction agency for the Department of the Army whose Chief reports to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics. The Chief of Engineers is the commander of the Corps of

Engineers and the senior engineer staff officer of the Department of the Army, and as such is in charge of the entire military-civil works program of the Corps of Engineers. Construction proposed for the Corps of Engineers totals \$1,913,000 for construction at 1 installation to provide operational and training facilities representing 0.6 percent of the program.

Transportation Corps.—The Transportation Corps, a technical service under the direction of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, provides or secures transportation services for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. This element of the program totals \$3,634,000 for construction at 1 installation to provide operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities representing 1.1 percent of the total program.

Medical Corps.—The Army Medical Service, headed by the Surgeon General who reports to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, furnishes the Army Establishment, and when appropriate, members of other uniformed services, medical and dental care, hospitalization, evacuation, preventive medicine, veterinary and other services essential to the maintenance of health. This program will provide \$862,000 for construction of 1 Medical Corps installation of troop housing, representing 0.3 percent of the total program.

Continental United States Armies

First United States Army.—A continental United States Army Command, the area of which is comprised of the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont. The program includes \$3,920,000, representing 1.2 percent.

Second United States Army.—A continental United States Army Command, the area of which is comprised of the States of Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia. The program contains \$3,331,000, representing 1.0 percent.

Third United States Army.—A continental United States Army Command, the area of which is comprised of the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee. The program includes \$10,974,000, representing 3.3 percent.

Fourth United States Army.—A continental United States Army Command, the area of which is comprised of the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas. There is included in the program \$21,219,000 in support of Fourth Army, representing 6.4 percent of the total program.

Fifth United States Army.—A continental United States Army Command, the area of which is comprised of the States of Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. The Fifth Army element of the program totals \$2,943,000, representing 0.9 percent.

Sixth United States Army.—A continental United States Army Command, the area of which is comprised of the States of Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington.

The program provides \$9,027,000 and utilities, representing 2.7 percent.

Other continental United States areas

The Military Academy.—The United States Military Academy, West Point, has the mission of instructing and training the Corps of Cadets, so that each graduate shall have the qualities and attributes essential to his progressive and continuing development throughout a lifetime career as an officer of the Regular Army. The Army's program contains \$5,844,000 for construction of troop housing, medical facilities, and community facilities at the Academy, representing 1.8 percent of the total program.

Armed Forces Special Weapons Project.—The Armed Forces Special Weapons Project is an agency of the Secretary of Defense and of the three military departments. Its mission is to furnish support to the departments in the field of atomic weapons by providing technical, logistical, and training services. The AFSWP responsibilities include national stockpile sites: Sandia Base at Albuquerque, N. Mex., a field command at Sandia Base, and the project headquarters. Construction in the amount of \$273,000 is included in the program, or 0.1 percent at 5 installations to provide maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities.

Tactical installations support.—These facilities provide the close logistical support for tactical defense installations in the continental United States. This element of the program totals \$6,311,000 at various installations, or 1.9 percent of the program, to provide maintenance facilities.

Overseas permanent and general areas

Alaskan area.—The Alaska Command provides the ground and anti-aircraft defense and logistic support of military bases in Alaska and operates the Army Arctic Test Center. The program includes \$7,000 for real estate at one location.

Pacific Command area.—The primary missions assigned to the Army in the Pacific are to assist in the ground defense of Korea by providing forces and logistic support thereof, to provide ground forces within the area of responsibility of the commander in chief, Pacific, to train and maintain all elements including Army Reserve components, to utilize resources provided for the conduct of planning required in support of the combined forces in the Pacific, and to provide for and maintain the security and combat readiness of assigned forces. The program for this command totals \$4,662,000 or 1.4 percent of the program for construction in Hawaii and Korea of operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities.

United States Army, Europe.—This element of the program totals \$4,063,000 for continuance of construction of the line of communication in France. The mission of the LOC is to provide logistical support for the combat forces of the United States Army stationed in Germany. The construction is for various installations, will provide operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements. It represents 1.2 percent of the total program.

Section 102

This section includes \$201,121,000 or 60.5 percent of the program for the establishment and development of classified Army installations, worldwide.

Section 103

This section includes \$25 million and will permit construction made necessary by changes in missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements or improved production schedules when deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be detrimental to the interests of our national security.

Section 104

This section authorizes the following: Construction or acquirement by lease or otherwise of family housing for occupancy as public quarters overseas pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and construction of family housing for occupancy as public quarters at 35 locations, and at various Army Air Defense Command stations in accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended.

Sections 105, 106, 107, and 108

These sections provide amendments to Public Law 209 of the 83d Congress, Public Laws 161 and 968 of the 84th Congress, and Public Law 85-241 of the 85th Congress, increasing authorizations granted in these laws at certain installations. These amendments, for the most part, are necessary to defray deficiencies in authorization granted in fiscal years 1954, 1956, 1957, and 1958, brought about basically by the general rise in construction cost indices throughout the world.

Section 109

This section deals with the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Tex., as previously discussed in the report.

TITLE II—NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

BRIEF OF NEW AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

Title II (Navy and Marine Corps):

Inside continental United States.....	\$216, 309, 000
Outside continental United States.....	16, 384, 000
Classified.....	66, 194, 000
Emergency construction.....	25, 000, 000
Total.....	323, 887, 000

The Navy and Marine force structure and activities which its fiscal year 1959 construction authorization requests are designed to support are shown in broad outline as follows:

(1) *Active Fleet*.—Operation of an Active Fleet with a planned force level for end fiscal year 1959 of 864 ships. The Active Fleet will be improved by receipt of 27 new ships and 9 newly converted ships from prior year construction programs. The major additions from new construction consist of one attack carrier, six destroyers and eight submarines of which three are nuclear and two with guided missile capabilities. Conversions include one attack carrier and three guided missile cruisers. Planned manning levels will be maintained constant at an average of 80 percent of wartime strength.

(2) *Shipbuilding*.—The shipbuilding program for fiscal year 1959 includes new construction of twenty-three ships consisting of five guided missile destroyers, seven guided missile frigates, including one nuclear powered frigate, eleven nuclear submarines including six fleet ballistic missile submarines and one with other guided missile capability. In addition, seven conversions are included consisting of two guided missile cruisers, one nuclear submarine, one amphibious ship and three auxiliary ships. A list of the various vessels in the 1959 budget program is shown below:

Priority	Vessel type	Number of vessels	New construction or conversion
1	Submarine SSG (N) FBM.....	2	New.
2	Submarine SS (N).....	4	Do.
3	Guided-missile submarine SSG (N).....	1	Do.
4	Submarine SS (N).....	1	Conversion.
5	Auxiliary submarine AG (SS).....	1	Do.
6	Guided-missile frigate DLG.....	6	New.
7	Guided-missile destroyer DDG.....	5	Do.
8	Guided-missile frigate DLG (N).....	1	Do.
9	Guided-missile cruiser CG.....	2	Conversion.
10	Amphibious assault ship LPH.....	1	New.
11	Amphibious transport, dock LPD.....	1	Do.
12	Seaplane tender AV.....	2	Conversion.
13	Attack transport APA.....	1	Do.
14	Small service and landing craft.....	55	New.

Provision is also made for continued maintenance and limited modernization of a reserve fleet estimated to be 1,510 vessels.

(3) *Operating aircraft*.—Naval aviation will utilize about 10,300 aircraft of which approximately 8,300 will be in daily operating status. The percent of modernity and combat potential will increase during fiscal year 1959 with the receipt of more modern aircraft. Additional Navy and Marine air squadrons will have guided missile capabilities.

(4) *Aircraft procurement*.—The aircraft procurement program is designed to modernize and increase the combat potential of the naval air arm. The fiscal year 1959 program provides for the procurement of approximately 697 aircraft with emphasis placed on starting new advanced models. Deliveries during fiscal year 1959 are estimated to total about 1,275 new modern aircraft.

(5) *Marine Corps*.—The Marine Corps will continue to maintain a balanced force in readiness of three combat divisions and three aircraft wings with necessary reinforcing combat and logistic support forces. The strength of the Marine Corps will be 200,000 military personnel at the end of fiscal year 1959.

(6) *Naval personnel*.—The budget provides for an end strength of 630,000 personnel for fiscal year 1959. The military strength of both the Navy and the Marine Corps during fiscal year 1959 will be maintained through voluntary enlistments.

(7) *Reserve personnel*.—The Navy Reserve personnel strength in drill-pay status during fiscal year 1959 will be approximately 135,000 and the Marine Corps 45,000. Emphasis will continue to be placed on practical, team-type training with attention to continued qualitative improvement. The Naval Reserve forces will continue to stress antisubmarine warfare training.

Military personnel, Navy

	Actual strengths		Projected strengths				
	June 30, 1957	Dec. 31, 1957	June 30, 1958		June 30, 1959	Average strength	
			Original 1958 act	Current estimate		Fiscal year 1958	Fiscal year 1959
Officers.....	73, 703	72, 543	73, 800	70, 600	68, 670	71, 718	69, 682
Enlisted.....	597, 859	551, 185	594, 700	568, 100	555, 186	575, 064	556, 552
Subtotal.....	671, 562	623, 728	668, 600	638, 700	623, 856	646, 782	626, 234
Midshipmen, aviation cadets, officer candidates, and avia- tion officer candidates.....	5, 546	5, 838	6, 500	6, 300	6, 144	6, 241	6, 213
Grand total.....	677, 108	629, 566	675, 000	645, 000	630, 000	653, 023	632, 447

Military personnel, Marine Corps

	Actual strengths				Projected strengths				
	June 30, 1957	Dec. 31, 1957	June 30, 1958		June 30, 1959		Average strengths		
			Original act	Current esti- mate	Budget	Com- mittee bill	Fiscal year 1958	Fiscal year 1959	
								Budget	Commit- tee bill
Officers.....	17, 434	16, 930	18, 000	16, 700	16, 200	17, 200	16, 826	16, 516	16, 730
Enlisted.....	183, 427	173, 778	182, 000	171, 300	158, 800	182, 800	176, 524	165, 178	177, 153
Total.....	200, 861	190, 708	200, 000	188, 000	175, 000	200, 000	193, 350	181, 694	193, 883

A summation of the fiscal year 1959 military construction authorization requests as originally presented to the committee follows:

Summary of objectives contained in title II (Navy)

	Amount	Percent
For research, development, and test facilities, including classified items and Polaris facilities at 7 continental United States installations-----	\$62,853,000	20.9
For new and improved operational, communications, and depot facilities at continental and overseas installations to support the needs of the expanding submarine and antisubmarine operations-----	43,352,000	14.4
For facilities to support the training of personnel, including \$14,800,000 for a naval air facility at Andrews Air Force Base; \$14,100,000 at 2 naval air training bases; \$4,600,000 at the Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Va., for joint service staff training; \$2,800,000 at 3 installations for nuclear-propulsion and guided-missile training; and \$4,200,000 at Naval Training Center, San Diego, Calif., for a communications school-----	40,499,000	13.5
For troop housing in the continental United States, including \$17,400,000 for barracks and messhalls for 6,671 enlisted personnel at 6 installations; \$14,200,000 for dormitory, classroom, and administrative facilities for 1,100 midshipmen at the Naval Academy, Annapolis; and \$6,200,000 for quarters for 779 officers and 150 aviation cadets at 5 naval air installations-----	37,799,000	12.6
For improvement of naval air shore establishments to meet requirements which result from the modernization of the fleet to increase its striking power, including \$9,300,000 as an additional increment in the development of the new Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif.; \$3,700,000 for facilities at the Naval Air Station, Harvey Point, N. C.; and \$8,000,000 for runway extensions at 1 continental and 1 overseas air station-----	26,057,000	8.7
For facilities becoming necessary due to changes in the missions of naval installations, new weapons development, unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules-----	25,000,000	8.3
For guided-missile facilities at 3 continental and 1 overseas installations to support the Navy programs of development, test, evaluation, training, and storage of guided missiles-----	19,618,000	6.5
For the improvement of waterfront facilities and dredging at Submarine Base, New London; Naval Base, Norfolk; Naval Shipyard, San Francisco; and Naval Air Station, Ford Island, T. H., to accommodate the nuclear submarines and large <i>Forrestal</i> class carriers; and additional waterfront and base facilities at Naval Air Station, Mayport, Fla., to accommodate increased operational requirements-----	15,282,000	5.1
For Marine training facilities, including \$2,900,000 at Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif., and \$3,200,000 at the Marine Corps air facilities, New River, N. C., and Santa Ana, Calif., in support of new equipment and techniques-----	6,209,000	2.1
For fee acquisition of 1,337 acres and easements over 399 acres of land, including \$732,000 for runway extensions at 3 continental and 1 overseas installation and \$1,440,000 for base expansion at Naval Air Station, Mayport, Fla-----	2,172,000	0.7
For facilities essential to the support of other programs and the naval operating forces, including improvements and modernization of utilities, communications, medical facilities, storage, site development, and other miscellaneous support items-----	22,221,000	7.2
Total-----	301,062,000	100.0

Categories of construction

A breakdown of the program by broad categories is as follows:

Analysis of title II (Navy) by category type of facilities to be provided

(Dollar amounts in millions)

	Zone of Interior	Per-cent	Over-seas	Per-cent	Total	Per-cent
1. Operational and training-----	32.9	27.5	10.5	3.5	93.4	31.0
2. Maintenance and production-----	20.8	6.9	.1	.1	20.9	7.0
3. Research, development, and test-----	69.5	23.1	0	0	69.5	23.1
4. Supply-----	4.1	1.4	3.8	1.2	7.9	2.6
5. Hospital and medical-----	9.9	3.3	0	0	9.9	3.3
6. Administrative-----	1.1	.1	0	0	1.1	.1
7. Housing and community-----	41.2	13.7	.3	.1	41.5	13.8
8. Utilities and ground improvements-----	27.3	9.1	1.4	.5	28.7	9.6
9. Real estate-----	3.0	1.0	.1	.1	3.1	1.1
10. Sec. 203-----	25.0	8.4	0	0	25.0	8.4
Total-----	284.8	94.5	16.2	5.5	301.0	100.0

The Navy would be authorized \$323,887,000 in this bill for new public works, and an increase of \$15,825,000 to compensate for increased costs to construct public works which had been authorized in previous years. This bill would authorize \$18,563,000 less than in fiscal year 1958. It is noted that \$421 million of unused authorization from previous years exists at the beginning of fiscal year 1959. The Navy estimates that, with the execution of its construction program and estimated rescissions, only \$247 million of unused authorization will exist at the beginning of fiscal year 1960.

Modernization

The Navy's program is an incremental part of its continuing long-range program to modernize its Shore Establishment to meet the requirements of new and advancing weapons systems and technology. Included is the replacement of obsolescent and deteriorated facilities.

Long Beach Naval Shipyard

The bill would authorize protection measures against flooding at the Long Beach Naval Shipyard in the amount of \$6 million, subject to the determination by the Secretary of the Navy that action taken to stop subsidence is effective. This is an increase from the \$500,000 submitted by the Navy for minimum protection against flooding until 1960. This action was taken in the light of a California State law providing for pressurization of the oilfield with salt water. The Secretary of the Navy would be directed to determine that action is effective in preventing further subsidence, otherwise only minimum measures to prevent flooding, in the amount of \$500,000 is to be accomplished.

Harvey Point and Lemoore

The incremental development of the new naval seaplane facility, Harvey Point, N. C., would continue at \$11,215,000, and the Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif., at \$15,823,000. The Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Fla., would be provided with facilities to accommodate aircraft carriers and escorts in the amount of \$9,892,000. This is the commencement of a program to convert this auxiliary air station into a naval base, which mission it now performs. The bill provides \$17,666,000 as the second increment of the naval air facility to be developed at Andrews Air Force Base. This is a decrease of \$855,000 from that submitted by the Navy for certain common use facilities which should be examined carefully to determine their absolute necessity. When completed, the Navy will transfer to the new facility all aviation activities now at the Anacostia Naval Air Station.

As part of the Towers Field project, it had been planned, by additional land acquisition and lengthening and improving its runway, to use Webster Field for practice landings of jet aircraft. Further study by the Navy, however, showed that by developing a dual runway at the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River a much safer operation for these high performance aircraft would result. This dual runway would cost approximately the same as the planned expansion at Webster Field. For these reasons, plus the advantages to be gained by building up at a fully operational station and the fact that no land acquisition would be necessary, it was determined preferable to improve at Patuxent River rather than at Webster Field.

Pacific missile range

The development of the Pacific missile range would be provided in the amount of \$13,841,000. Under an agreement among the services the Navy is responsible for general management, and provides facilities for common use. Pursuant to this agreement, and to enhance Navy missile research, development, and test, facilities would be located at Cooke Air Force Base, the missile facility, Point Arguello, San Nicolas Island, and Naval Air Station, Point Mugu.

Pier and dredging, San Diego

In view of the phased replacement of the *Essex* class aircraft carriers in the fleet, the committee considers that action should be taken now to provide for berthing for the deeper draft *Forrestal* class aircraft carriers at San Diego. Accordingly, an item for a pier and dredging has been introduced in the amount of \$7 million.

The Navy submission included authorization to construct unnamed public works in the amount of \$25 million. This would provide for requirements not now foreseen, but which could not be deferred to be included in the next military authorization construction act. The committee considers that this provision is justified.

The program submitted by the Navy consists of 11 classes of facilities as follows:

1. Shipyard facilities

Shipyard facilities are required for protection of existing facilities, and to support operations of new type submarines and large, modern aircraft carriers

This class of facilities is composed of 7 line items at 4 Continental activities and 1 line item at 1 overseas location. A major project consists of two line items at New London, Conn., one of which will augment the berthing facilities at this submarine base for the newer nuclear submarines, and another designed to improve communications and thus render more efficient and economical the control of submarines by the Atlantic Submarine Type Commander. A project for the temporary oceanographic research facility at Cape May, N. J., will guard that installation against erosion of the beach opposite it until a permanent station in a more protected location can be established.

A dredging project at the San Francisco Naval Shipyard will permit the access by *Forrestal* class carriers to dry dock No. IV at times other than high tide, and will, in addition, provide needed berthing space alongside certain of the piers for ships of this class. It will permit homeporting of one of these large carriers at a west coast operating base for the first time. A project for the Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, T. H., will provide a storage building for the storage and ready issue of compressed high energy fuel in support of submarines and submarine and antisubmarine weapons.

2. Fleet base facilities

Fleet base facilities include 2 projects required at 2 east coast stations in support of uniformed personnel and the fleet.

The first of these two projects is at the United States Naval Station, Newport, R. I. It consists of two line items at an estimated cost of \$1,709,000. The first item is for provision of a messhall at a cost of \$1,048,000. It will replace the present deteriorated wood structure which was built in World War II as a temporary facility. The second

item is for construction of an enlisted men's service club, at a cost of \$661,000, to accommodate fleet and shore-based personnel on liberty in this community where recreation and amusement facilities are limited for the large number of enlisted men involved.

The second project is at the United States Naval Base, Norfolk, Va., for dredging an area in the Elizabeth River approaches to the naval base piers at an estimated cost of \$2,546,000. It is required to minimize danger of grounding or collision when docking or undocking large carriers of the Navy's striking force.

3. Aviation facilities

The aviation shore activities are required for training naval aviators, for supporting the operating forces, including the Marine Corps, and for research and development in the aeronautical field. The projects in the bill under the sponsorship of the Bureau of Aeronautics are designed to enable the Naval Aeronautical Shore Establishment to attain its mission and to improve safety of air operations.

Aviation facilities comprise approximately 40 percent of the Navy's program dollarwise. This class includes 128 line items at 26 air stations.

The aviation facilities are composed of five groups of air stations. The first group consists of 17 line items at 3 naval air training stations. These items provide for the third increment in the development of the air training stations at Meridian, Miss.; for the construction of an outlying field for the Auxiliary Air Station at Whiting Field, Fla.; and the construction of a barracks for the maintenance crews at NAS, Kingsville, Tex.

The second group, the fleet support air stations, consists of 50 line items at 11 stations. Included are second increments and additional items for development of the master jet field at Lemoore, Calif.; second increment and additional items for a seaplane facility at Harvey Point, N. C.; and line items including land acquisition for the development of Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Fla. Projects are included for liquid oxygen facilities at 4 stations, optical landing system installations at 3 stations, and a jet engine maintenance shop at NAS, Cecil Field, Fla.

The third group consists of 6 line items at 4 Marine Corps Air Stations and Air Facilities. These items include extension of the runway and land acquisition at Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, S. C.; a radar air traffic control center and supply storehouse at Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C.; aircraft parking aprons for helicopters at Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, N. C., and Santa Ana, Calif.; and fuel storage facilities at Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, N. C.

The fourth group of 2 special-purpose air stations includes 38 line items. Projects for the first of these stations will develop the Naval Air Facility, John H. Towers Field at Andrews Air Force Base, and provide nearby facility for landing practice at NAS Patuxent, Md. This will permit flight operations to be transferred from the Naval Air Station, Anacostia. Projects for the second station continue development of the Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, Calif., and include 3 line items for San Nicolas Island and 5 items for the extension of the Pacific Missile Range, operating from the former Army Camp Cooke.

The final aviation facilities group are 17 line items at 6 existing air stations. The program includes a third increment for facilities at

Roosevelt Roads where guided-missile training for the Navy operating forces of the Atlantic Fleet is to be carried on. Another major item in the group provides for the extension of a runway at Naval Air Station, Guam, in order to safely handle jet-type aircraft. The other projects will continue the development of strategic overseas naval air facilities.

4. Supply facilities

The Bureau of Supplies and Accounts' shore facilities provide worldwide supply support to the fleet. Supply centers and depots replenish warships directly and through fleet issue ships and tankers, which, in turn, deliver underway to the fleet wherever deployed at sea. Navy materials are furnished naval installations such as shipyards and bases, air stations, training centers, etc. The procurement, inventory, and financial control of over a million items of repair parts and consumable supplies is performed with business machines located at the supply control offices and depots.

This group of projects will provide a rehabilitated and improved steam system for receiving, storing, and issuing petroleum products to the fleet at the Naval Supply Depot, Newport, R. I., the first increment of an underground petroleum storage facility for the Pacific fleet at the Naval Supply Depot, Guam, and the building alterations to install electronic data processing machines for stock and inventory control at the Naval Supply Centers, Oakland, Calif., and Norfolk, Va.

5. Marine Corps facilities

The mission and purpose of the Marine Corps shore facilities are to support the Marine Corps combat forces in order that they may be maintained in readiness to engage promptly and effectively in combat operations with continuing maximum efforts devoted to cumulative improvements in readiness at all levels.

The Marine Corps is subject to call on short notice to deploy its forces, ranging in size from a few men to a division, to any part of the world for guard duty, to quell a disturbance, or to participate in full-scale war. Consequently, the marines must be highly trained in amphibious and other means of warfare, and competently led. Constant training is necessary to obtain and retain proficiency. This group of projects consists of 11 line items at 6 continental Marine Corps activities. Facilities will be provided for maintenance of Marine equipment and support and training of personnel.

6. Ordnance facilities

The objective of the military construction program of the Bureau of Ordnance is to provide and keep modern facilities ashore for effective support of the fleet and for the conduct of research, design, development, limited production, test, and evaluation materials, components, assemblies, and systems principally in the fields of rockets, missiles, and underwater ordnance.

This program contains 13 line items at 12 continental locations. Seven of these items totaling \$2,661,000 or 14.6 percent of the ordnance program are at activities doing important research and development work on missiles; 3, totaling \$3,356,000 or 18.5 percent of the program, are guided-missile support facilities, 2, totaling \$1,774,000 or 9.7 percent of the program, are antisubmarine weapon support facilities; 1, for \$86,000 or one-half of 1 percent of the program, is for

support of conventional weapons; and 1 classified project for \$1,-193,000 or 56.7 percent of the ordnance program.

7. Service school facilities

The Bureau of Naval Personnel is responsible for the procurement, distribution, training, education, discharge, promotion, and retirement of Navy personnel, and for the processing and maintenance of records of Navy personnel.

This group of projects consists of 8 line items at 8 locations. They provide for training and support facilities. Included is the second increment for extension of Bancroft Hall at the Naval Academy to alleviate the longstanding problem of the crowded living conditions of the midshipmen. Also included are items to provide facilities to train personnel in the fields of nuclear power propulsion and guided missiles.

8. Medical facilities

There are two line items at the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md. These items will provide for replacement of inadequate or temporary medical facilities, and new facilities for radiation exposure evaluation.

9. Communication facilities

The mission of naval communications is to provide required reliable, secure, rapid communications primarily for control of the operating forces, and secondarily to facilitate the administration of the Naval Establishment.

In the group of projects for communications facilities are one continental project and three overseas projects.

The continental project at the United States Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine, will provide very low frequency transmitting facilities to support the operation of submarine forces, surface forces, and special communication functions in the North Atlantic and Arctic areas.

The program for communications facilities at overseas activities consists of three projects which will provide facilities to house radio receiving equipment which will permit vital area coverage for a special ship-shore communications net. Facilities will be installed at Asmara, Eritrea; Londonderry, North Ireland; and Port Lyautey, Morocco. These projects are essential to operations under the control of the Navy in the North Atlantic and Mediterranean areas.

10. Office of Naval Research

Public works sponsored by the Office of Naval Research are for the purpose of providing adequate facilities for conducting scientific research and development in the fields of nuclear physics and radio astronomy.

There are only 2 line items at 2 continental locations in this group. The first line item for \$192,000 will provide for an additional floor in the 3-story laboratory building at the Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia, to provide needed space to further research in the nuclear field. The other line item will provide facilities for the Naval Radio Research Laboratory at Sugar Grove, W. Va.

11. *Yards and Docks facilities*

The shore activities of the Bureau of Yards and Docks (a) receive, store, and issue construction materials and packaged overseas base utility and public-works systems; (b) operate and maintain facilities at major naval bases; and (c) supervise construction of the Navy and, if required, the Air Force public-works program.

This group of two line items will provide (a) an augmented water-supply system, alleviating a critical water shortage and a substandard fire-protection system, and (b) an additional facility to correct an inadequate electric power system. Both items are for the Atlantic Fleet's Naval Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

BRIEF OF NEW AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

Title III (Air Force):

Inside continental United States.....	\$541, 236, 000
Outside continental United States.....	123, 654, 000
Classified.....	195, 500, 000
Emergency construction.....	25, 000, 000

Total.....	885, 390, 000
------------	---------------

The Air Force would be authorized \$885,390,000 in this bill to provide for the construction of new facilities at 160 major installations, of which 109 are inside the United States and 51 are outside the United States. The bill also provides facilities at a number of installations and sites, including operational sites for strategic, defense, and tactical missiles, offbase navigational aids, aircraft control and warning system sites, and facilities at classified locations. In addition, the bill provides an increased authorization in the amount of \$4,372,000 for the Air Force Academy by amending Public Law 325, 83d Congress. Finally, the bill provides an increase of \$13,411,000 in authorization in prior years' laws to cover the increased costs of certain approved projects.

The Air Force will have a major force structure of 117 wings by the end of fiscal year 1958. The fiscal year 1959 military construction program of the Air Force includes the minimum facilities to provide an operational capability to the forces planned at end fiscal year 1961.

Comparative Air Force personnel strengths and their utilization are shown as follows:

Military personnel strengths—Air Force

Category	Actual 1957		Planned 1958		Planned 1959	
	Average strength	End strength June 30, 1957	Average strength	End strength June 30, 1958	Average strength	End strength June 30, 1959
Officers.....	141,436	140,563	136,211	133,000	134,009	132,600
Enlisted.....	769,700	776,566	753,899	739,050	727,056	714,320
Aviation Cadets.....	2,712	2,202	1,836	2,200	2,115	2,200
Cadets, Air Force Academy.....	514	504	764	750	1,128	880
Total.....	914,362	919,835	892,710	875,000	864,308	850,000

Air Force—Military personnel utilization

Category	Actual, June 30, 1957	Programed	
		June 30, 1958	June 30, 1959
1. Officers and warrant officers (total).....	140,563	133,000	132,600
a. On flying status (excluding officers in flying training).....	79,300	75,597	74,420
b. In flying training.....	5,694	4,498	3,434
c. Nonflying.....	55,569	52,905	54,746
2. Airmen (total).....	776,566	739,050	714,320
a. On flying status (excluding airmen in flying training).....	29,482	32,065	30,816
b. In flying training.....	64	95	94
c. Nonflying.....	747,020	706,890	683,410
3. Aviation cadets (total).....	2,202	2,200	2,200
a. On flying status (excluding aviation cadets in flying training).....	0	0	0
b. In flying training.....	1,972	1,830	1,748
c. Nonflying ¹	230	370	452

¹ Aviation cadets in preflight.

A summation of the fiscal year 1959 military construction authorization requests as originally submitted to the committee is shown by program objectives as follows:

Summary of program objectives contained in title III (Air Force)

	Amount	Percent
For construction of facilities at bases in the United States, required for the dispersal of Strategic Air Command units.....	\$174,644,000	17.7
For construction of necessary facilities in support of ballistic missiles.....	165,900,000	16.8
For additional facilities and utilities projects required in support of AC&W stations in the United States, Alaska, and Canada.....	125,239,000	12.7
For construction of necessary facilities in support of the BOMARC missile at various locations in the United States.....	121,741,000	12.3
For troop housing and dining facilities in the continental United States and overseas areas, including \$27,319,000 for 13,205 airmen dormitory spaces; \$1,163,000 for rehabilitation of 847 existing dormitory spaces; \$7,159,000 for 831 BOQ spaces and \$7,210,000 for dining halls.....	42,851,000	4.3
For construction of 5 additional SAGE centers and for other support facilities for the continued buildup of the present SAGE system.....	40,385,000	4.1
For the construction of facilities required to reduce operational and training deficiencies at various Air Force bases.....	35,321,000	3.6
For construction of necessary facilities in support of strategic missiles at various locations in the United States.....	29,600,000	3.0
For the construction of maintenance shops required to reduce deficiencies at various locations worldwide.....	27,307,000	2.8
For the eastern extension of the DEW line.....	25,000,000	2.5
For the construction of necessary facilities required by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules.....	25,000,000	2.5
For the construction of facilities in support of Strategic Air Command missions at overseas bases.....	20,633,000	2.1
For the construction of necessary facilities in support of fighter interceptor squadrons, and the continued development of the Fighter Weapons Employment center.....	19,506,000	2.0
For community, welfare, and morale facilities in the United States and in overseas areas.....	19,082,000	1.9
For the expansion of Andrews Air Force Base to accommodate Air Force units now located at Bolling Air Force Base and Washington National Airport.....	18,937,000	1.9
For the construction of hospital and medical facilities.....	18,593,000	1.8
Including \$16,137,000 for new 50-bed hospitals at— Glasgow Air Force Base, Mont. Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak. K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Mich. Kinross Air Force Base, Mich. Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich. Beale Air Force Base, Calif. Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wis.		
For construction of missile master facilities at various locations in the continental United States.....	13,356,000	1.4
For research and development facilities at various locations in the United States.....	12,471,000	1.3
For construction of necessary facilities in support of the MATADOR missile at various locations overseas.....	8,638,000	.9
For the construction and modernization of facilities at Air Materiel Command depots in the United States.....	7,558,000	.8
For fee acquisition of 2,078 acres (\$1,363,000) at 26 named installations and easement over 3,400 acres (\$289,000) at 15 named installations and 7 AC&W sites.....	1,652,000	.2
For facilities supporting other essential programs worldwide, including utilities items, administrative facilities, and classified projects.....	32,857,000	3.4
Total.....	986,271,000	100.0

¹ NOTE.—Principal change to the above is the deletion of the authorizations requested for BOMARC from title II (Air Force), and inclusion of the authority in title IV (Defense) as previously mentioned.

*Categories of construction**Analysis of title III (Air Force) by category type of facilities to be provided*

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Categories	Zone of interior	Percent	Overseas	Percent	Total	Percent
1. Operational and training.....	\$560.4	56.8	\$121.8	12.4	\$682.2	69.2
2. Maintenance and production.....	50.2	5.1	14.2	1.4	64.4	6.5
3. Research, development, and test.....	12.5	1.3	0		12.5	1.3
4. Supply.....	26.8	2.7	9.2	.9	36.0	3.6
5. Hospital and medical.....	17.9	1.8	.7	.1	18.6	1.9
6. Administrative.....	4.1	.4	.2		4.3	.4
7. Housing and community.....	48.0	4.9	14.0	1.4	62.0	6.3
8. Utilities and ground improvements.....	64.7	6.6	14.6	1.5	79.3	8.1
9. Real estate.....	2.0	.2	0		2.0	.2
10. Sec. 303.....	25.0	2.5	0		25.0	2.5
Total.....	811.6	82.3	174.7	17.7	986.3	100.0

A breakout of the Air Force authorization request by command is contained in the following table:

Command	Authorized amount	Percent of total
Inside the United States:	<i>Thousands</i>	
Air Defense Command.....	\$66,738	6.9
Air Materiel Command.....	34,595	3.6
Air Research and Development Command.....	28,270	3.0
Air Training Command.....	23,090	2.4
Continental Air Command.....	13,566	1.4
Headquarters Command.....	18,937	2.0
Military Air Transport Service.....	7,276	.7
Strategic Air Command.....	164,298	17.1
Tactical Air Command.....	15,819	1.6
Special facilities.....	563	.1
Aircraft control and warning system.....	163,066	17.0
Total, inside the United States.....	536,218	55.8
Outside the United States:		
Air Materiel Command.....	696	.1
Alaskan Air Command.....	26,416	2.7
Caribbean Air Command.....	1,540	.2
Military Air Transport Service.....	5,347	.5
Pacific Air Forces.....	16,671	1.7
Strategic Air Command.....	23,582	2.4
United States Air Forces in Europe.....	19,952	2.1
Aircraft control and warning system.....	29,135	3.0
Special facilities.....	315	.1
Total, outside the United States.....	123,654	12.8
Sec. 302: Ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles.....	287,500	29.9
Sec. 303: Unforeseen construction.....	10,000	1.0
Sec. 309: Air Force Academy.....	4,372	.5
Total new authorization.....	961,744	100.0

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

The mission of this command is to provide for the air defense of the continental United States.

This program contains a request for \$66,738,000 and provides operating facilities at 17 locations.

Included within the total of \$66,738,000 is an amount of \$30,881,000 to provide facilities in support of Strategic Air Command heavy bomber and/or tanker squadrons at 9 locations, an amount of \$842,000 to provide support facilities for SAGE at 2 locations, and an amount of \$520,000 to provide support facilities for Military Air Transport Command at 1 location.

The remainder of the Air Defense Command program, totaling \$34,495,000, provides facilities required to support the basic mission.

Facilities in support of the Air Defense Command are also included in the Air Research and Development Command for \$762,000, the Air Training Command for \$2,191,000, the Military Air Transport Service for \$222,000, the Strategic Air Command for \$6,652,000, and the Tactical Air Command for \$836,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

The mission of the Air Materiel Command is to (1) provide adequate and efficient systems of procurement, production, maintenance, and supply for the United States Air Force; (2) provide general over-all logistical support for all activities and agencies for the United States Air Force; (3) train specialized units for accomplishment of specified logistics functions in overseas areas and theaters; and (4) train individuals requiring a long training lead time to fill requirements of air-depot-type units scheduled for activation and to fill replacement requirements. This program contains a request for \$34,595,000 for Air Materiel Command and provides facilities at 12 locations.

Included within the Air Materiel Command total program are facilities for Air Materiel Command depot supply and maintenance requirements totaling \$8,142,000. The SAC mission at 3 AMC locations requires a total of \$8,788,000, and there are Research and Development requirements at 1 AMC location estimated to cost \$6,500,000. The remainder of the program is composed of items to satisfy the basic Air Materiel mission requirement.

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

The mission of the Air Research and Development Command is to attain and maintain qualitative superiority by the following procedures: (1) Conduct or supervise scientific and technical studies required for the accomplishment of Air Force missions; (2) seek new basic knowledge from which improved aeronautical equipment, material, weapons, and techniques can be developed; (3) undertake the development and recommend the adoption of appropriate new and improved devices and systems for the conduct and support of air warfare, including aircraft, missiles, weapons, techniques, and procedures applicable to Air Force purposes; (4) perform employment and suitability testing of aircraft, guided missiles, navigational aids, components, and material. This program contains a request for \$28,270,000 for Research and Development Command and provides facilities at 10 locations, including 3 auxiliary sites.

Included within the Air Research and Development Command total program are facilities for research, development, and testing totaling \$5,971,000; Air Defense fighter-interceptor squadron at 1 base totaling \$481,000; Air Defense missile training at 2 bases totaling \$531,000; and a SAC mission at 1 location totaling \$3,116,000. The remainder of the program is composed of items to support the basic ARDC mission requirement. Facilities in support of the Air Research and Development Command are also included in the Air Materiel Command program in the amount of \$6,500,000.

SCHOOL OF AVIATION MEDICINE

Under this heading, authority has been provided in the amount of \$12 million for facilities for the School of Aviation Medicine.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

The mission of the Air Training Command is to provide flying training leading to an aeronautical rating; aircrew training; basic and advanced technical training leading to an Air Force specialty; basic military training; mobile training, and such other training as may be directed by the Chief of Staff, USAF. This program contains a request for \$23,090,000 for Air Training Command and provides facilities at 18 locations.

Included in the above total is \$16,056,000 which provides facilities for the basic Air Training Command mission. Facilities are also included to accommodate SAC missions totaling \$4,843,000, and an Air Defense Command mission for \$2,191,000.

CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

The mission of the Continental Air Command is to discharge within the continental United States field responsibilities of the USAF Chief of Staff with respect to Reserve forces for the Air Force that are assigned to Continental Air Command, including supervision and inspection of Air National Guard; domestic emergencies, and miscellaneous administrative functions; and, in event of war or other emergency, to mobilize units and/or individuals of the Air Force Reserve that are assigned to the Continental Air Command. This program contains a request for \$13,566,000 and provides facilities at 3 locations.

Included in the program is \$1,805,000 for facilities at the School of Aviation Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base; the second increment of phased operational facilities to support a SAC mission at Clinton County Air Force Base totaling \$11,589,000 and \$172,000 for a heating plant at Dobbins Air Force Base.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

The mission of the Headquarters Command is to provide proficiency flying, training, housekeeping, and support of United States Air Force personnel in the Washington area. Specifically, this command provides administrative and logistic support for the USAF headquarters squadron, for those Air Force units stationed within the Washington area where inherent organizational structure does not permit other support, and such other missions as may be directed by the Chief of Staff, USAF. This program contains a request for \$18,937,000 for Headquarters Command and provides facilities at one location, primarily to allow the moving of combat readiness training (CRT) activities from Bolling Air Force Base to Andrews Air Force Base.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

The mission of the Military Air Transport Service is to provide: (1) airlift required in support of approved joint war plans; (2) sched-

uled airlift for the Department of Defense within the continental United States, between the continental United States and overseas areas, and between and within overseas areas as directed by higher authority; (3) worldwide air transport, air weather, airways and air communications and air rescue service systems; (4) flight service within the Zone of Interior; (5) organization and training of air resupply and communications services; (6) supervision and control and maintenance of primary facilities required for performing its assigned mission; and (7) theater jurisdiction in overseas areas where MATS units are stationed but which are outside the jurisdiction of any theater commander. This program contains a request for \$7,276,000 for Military Air Transport Service and provides facilities at 4 locations.

Included within the Military Air Transport Service total program are facilities for air defense missions costing \$222,000; facilities for United States Navy air transport squadrons at 1 base, costing \$626,000; facilities for SAC tanker missions at 2 bases, costing \$4,668,000. The remainder of the program is composed of items to satisfy the basic MATS mission requirements.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

The mission of this command is to organize, train, equip, administer, and prepare a force capable of conducting strategic air operations in accordance with directives and policies issued by Headquarters, United States Air Force. This program contains a request for \$164,-298,000 for the Strategic Air Command and provides facilities at 40 locations.

Included in the Strategic Air Command program is an amount of \$70,929,000 to provide alert capability at 15 heavy-bomber bases, and 15 medium-bomber bases. An amount of \$22,380,000 is requested to provide additional facilities required at 10 heavy bomber home bases. Of this amount, approximately \$3,400,000 is requested for facilities necessary to convert Beale Air Force Base to a heavy bomber home base and approximately \$8 million is included for airfield pavement strengthening and replacement. An amount of \$4,888,000 is requested to provide additional facilities necessary at 6 heavy bomber dispersal bases included in prior programs. An amount of \$15,552,000 contained in this program provides for construction of the second increment of facilities at Richard I. Bong Air Force Base. In addition, \$11,417,000 is provided for the relocation of a Strategic Air Command tanker squadron on a joint-utilization basis with the Navy at Brunswick Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine.

An amount of \$148,000 will provide facilities to support SAGE. An amount of \$3,799,000 is requested to accommodate redeployment of air defense fighter missions at 3 bases. In addition, \$2,853,000 is included to provide required facilities for air defense missions at 7 Strategic Air Command bases.

The remainder of the Strategic Air Command program, amounting to \$32,332,000 will provide for items required to support the basic mission throughout the entire command.

In addition to the program specified in the foregoing paragraphs, facilities to support the Strategic Air Command are included within other major Zone of Interior commands as follows:

Air Defense Command.....	\$28,749,000
Air Materiel Command.....	15,288,000
Air Research and Development Command.....	3,116,000
Air Training Command.....	4,843,000
Continental Air Command.....	11,589,000
Military Air Transport Service.....	4,668,000
Tactical Air Command.....	5,677,000

This authorization requested within other commands amounts to a total of \$73,930,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

The mission of the Tactical Air Command is to organize, equip, train, and administer the forces assigned or attached, to participate in tactical air operations, including light and tactical bombardment, day fighter, fighter bomber, tactical missiles, troop carrier, reconnaissance and support units; maintenance of liaison with Continental Army Command and the determination of the amount of Tactical Air Command resources to allocate for the training of Air Force and Army personnel and units in air-ground operations; and maintenance of a capability and development of plans for the deployment of mobile atomic strike forces for use in tactical air operations in any area of the world independent of or in concert with other land, air, naval and/or amphibious forces. This program contains a request for \$15,819,000 for Tactical Air Command and provides facilities at 7 locations.

Included within the Tactical Air Command total program are facilities for operational and base support items totaling \$7,546,000. The balance of the program provides facilities for a mission at 2 locations for \$5,677,000 and an ADC mission at 1 base costing \$2,596,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES (ZONE OF INTERIOR)

This section contains special facilities of an operational nature amounting to \$563,000. These facilities will support a classified mission and they are to be constructed at three locations. Two locations have not been firmly selected. The third location, although selected, is classified.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM, ZONE OF INTERIOR

The aircraft control and warning system is the ground environment portion of the air defense system. The aircraft control and warning function is to detect and identify all airborne objects, evaluate the threat, commit and control weapons such as manned interceptors and missiles for the destruction of enemy targets. The Zone of Interior aircraft control and warning portion of this program totals \$163,066,000. This section consists of the following programs:

The first program will provide \$100 million for the initiation of an extensive radar improvement program. This program will provide for electric power, utilities, radar towers and real estate to support new and highly improved radar equipment. This will improve identification capabilities as well as decreasing enemy capabilities to effec-

tively utilize electronic countermeasures against our radars. The construction involved in this type of radar improvement consists primarily of the procurement and installation of enclosed radar towers and the provision of large quantities of electric power for operation of the newer high-powered radars.

The next program will provide \$27,029,000 to construct SAGE direction centers. This request will provide for five direction centers as an increment toward the completion of the total SAGE program.

The next program provides \$1,456,000 for SAGE support type facilities. Specifically, this item will construct operational type facilities at four locations; maintenance facilities at one location, supply facilities at 3 locations, administrative facilities at 4 locations, personnel facilities at 2 locations, and utilities at 2 locations.

The next program provides \$4,232,000 for SAGE communications facilities. This will furnish communications receivers at 19 locations, communications transmitters at 21 locations, and addition to the aircraft control and warning operational buildings at 21 locations.

The next program provides \$13,466,000 for various facilities at aircraft control and warning sites throughout the Zone of Interior. This program will construct 5 new manned aircraft control and warning sites and 8 new unmanned automatic radar stations (gap fillers). In addition, it provides various support and personnel facilities for existing sites inside the United States.

The last program provides \$16,883,000 for construction of the Air Force portion of a joint Army-Air Force operated missile defense center system in the United States. Present plans call for a number of centers in this system, also known as the Missile Master, with the Air Force being the host at some centers and the Army being the host at others. This request will provide technical and support facilities at the Air Force locations and technical facilities only at the Army locations.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND (OVERSEAS)

The mission of the Air Materiel Command is to provide adequate and efficient systems of procurement, production, maintenance and supply for the United States Air Force; provide general overall logistical support for all activities and agencies of the United States Air Force; train specialized units for the accomplishment of specified logistics functions in overseas areas and theaters; and, train individuals to fill requirements of newly activated air depot units and replacement requests.

This program contains a request for \$696,000 and provides facilities at one location.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

The mission of the Alaskan Air Command is to organize and conduct the air defense of Alaska and provide early warning to the United States and Canada. This command supports the Strategic Air Command, Military Air Transport Service, COMALSEAFRON, the United States Army, and the northwest route to the Orient. This program contains a request for \$26,416,000 for the Alaskan Air Command and provides facilities at 3 bases and 7 various locations.

Included within the Alaskan Air Command total program are facilities at 6 locations totaling \$12,503,000 for ground control intercept

radar stations related to the western extension of DEW line and the air defense system; Air Force security service mission at 2 locations totaling \$13,193,000; the remainder of the program is composed of items totaling \$720,000 to satisfy the basic mission requirement.

CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

The mission of the Caribbean Air Command is to provide supervision, guidance, and administrative control of the USAF missions in Latin America; provide supervision, guidance, and administrative control of the Air Force phase of the mutual defense assistance program (MDAP) for Latin American countries; conduct a USAF school for Latin America; provide logistic support for air attachés and USAF missions in Latin America; provide airlift within Latin America for the inter-American geodetic survey team and provide administrative control of the United States Air Force Section, Joint Brazil-United States Military Commission. This program contains a request for \$1,540,000 for the Caribbean Air Command and provides facilities at one base.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE (OVERSEAS)

The mission of the Military Air Transport Service is to provide aircraft required in support of approved joint war plans; scheduled airlifts for the Department of Defense between the continental United States and overseas areas; between and within overseas areas; worldwide air transport; air weather; airways and air communications; air rescue service systems; and organization and training of air resupply and communications service and all elements thereof. This program contains a request for \$5,347,000 for the Military Air Transport Service and provides facilities at three various locations.

Included within the Military Air Transport Service program are facilities for the Military Air Transport Service to satisfy the basic mission requirements totaling \$4,507,000 at 3 locations, and facilities in support of the SAC mission totaling \$840,000 at these same 3 locations.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

The mission of the Pacific Air Forces is to conduct tactical air operations, the air defense of Japan, Ryukyus, Marianas, Hawaii, and the United States installations in the Philippines; provide air transportation for combat troops, other personnel and supplies in the Pacific and Far East areas; and, to provide logistic support to PACAF and SAC forces. This program contains a request for \$16,671,000 for the Pacific Air Forces and provides facilities at 2 bases and 11 various locations.

The Pacific Air Forces program includes facilities for a classified operational mission at 2 locations totaling \$7,050,000, a mobile radio squadron at 1 classified location for \$857,000 and a fighter mission at 1 location for \$203,000; 1 project for \$116,000 in support of the SAC mission; \$839,000 in support of overseas Military Air Transport Service at 1 location. The remainder of the program totaling \$7,606,000 is composed of items to meet the basic Pacific Air Forces mission requirements.

Included in the Strategic Air Command are facilities for \$343,000 at Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, in support of fighter interceptor aircraft at this base.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND (OVERSEAS)

The mission of this command is to organize, train, equip, administer, and prepare a force capable of conducting strategic air operations in accordance with directives and policies issued by Headquarters, United States Air Force. This program contains a request for \$23,582,000 for the Strategic Air Command and provides facilities at 2 Air Force bases and 8 various locations located in Great Britain, Greenland, Guam, Morocco, Newfoundland, Puerto Rico, and Spain.

Included within Strategic Air Command program are facilities to support MATS operations totaling \$342,000 and at 3 locations projects for support of tenant fighter interceptor aircraft totaling \$1,073,000, broken down as follows: \$343,000 Pacific Air Forces and \$221,000 Air Defense Command overseas. The remainder of the program is composed of items to satisfy the basic SAC mission requirements. In addition to the program outlined above, facilities to support the Strategic Air Command are included within the MATS overseas program in the amount of \$840,000 and Pacific Air Forces in the amount of \$116,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

The mission of the United States Air Forces in Europe is to support the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe; United States Commander in Chief, Europe, and the other component commanders under USCINCEUR in their assigned missions; to fulfill responsibilities assigned the Joint Chiefs of Staff in areas not included in either the NATO or USCINCEUR's area of responsibility, and to support commanders operating directly under the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This program contains a request for \$19,952,000 for United States Air Forces in Europe and provides facilities at 30 locations.

Included in the program are facilities to support aircraft control and warning activities at 4 locations totaling \$672,000; mobile radio squadrons at 3 locations totaling \$5,101,000; 6 locations for ammunition storage and rocket assembly totaling \$2,298,000; fighter aircraft at 6 locations totaling \$3,870,000; fighter bomber aircraft at 5 bases totaling \$544,000; troop carrier aircraft at one location totaling \$964,000; tactical reconnaissance aircraft at 1 location totaling \$232,000; facilities at 3 bases totaling \$2,822,000 in support of tactical guided missiles; and, medical facilities at 2 locations totaling \$682,000; also included are 250 family units at 2 locations. The remainder of the program, totaling \$2,767,000, is composed of items to satisfy the basic USAFE mission requirement.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM OVERSEAS

The overseas aircraft control and warning portion of this program totals \$29,135,000. Of this, \$25 million is for the eastward extension of the DEW line and \$4,135,000 is for electric power, heated auto storage, dormitories, and utilities at various aircraft control and warning sites.

SPECIAL FACILITIES—VARIOUS LOCATIONS

This section covers special facilities at various overseas locations totaling \$315,000 for 4 classified projects at 4 locations.

The requirement for each facility is dictated by the progress of technical developments pertinent to the accomplishment of the mission.

RATIO OF CONSTRUCTION IN OVERSEAS AREAS

Of the \$123 million shown for outside the United States, \$31,189,000 are in United States Territories and possessions, and \$48,881,000 are for projects on the North American Continent which directly contribute to continental defense. This leaves only \$43,584,000 or less than 5 percent of the total program for projects in what we would term "foreign" countries. This annually decreasing ratio of foreign construction in the Air Force program is in line with the progress being made to improve the intercontinental strike capability of the Strategic Air Command and the increased contributions of their self-defense by our allies.

BALLISTIC, STRATEGIC, AND DEFENSE MISSILES

The Air Force program provides a total of \$195,500,000 for facilities for ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles. This amount includes authorization for construction of operational ATLAS facilities at one additional location, not yet firmly selected, and support facilities for both the previously programed and the new ATLAS site. It also includes authorization for the construction of hardened facilities for the TITAN ICBM. In addition, the fiscal year 1959 program provides for construction of operational facilities for the intermediate range ballistic missile at overseas locations and for test and training facilities for both the ICBM and the IRBM at Cooke Air Force Base. This package also contains facilities for the HOUNDDOG and the QUAIL air-to-surface missiles carried by Strategic Air Command bombers to provide them with greater penetration capability. The package also provides facilities in the United States for the GOOSE which is a surface-to-surface air-breathing missile with an intercontinental range. Facilities for the GOOSE missile also were authorized in fiscal year 1958. The Air Force program also contains authorization for facilities for the BOMARC missile. Construction of facilities for this missile was initiated in the fiscal year 1958 construction program at 4 locations. This fiscal year 1959 request will add facilities at 10 additional locations.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Section 309 of the bill amends Public Law 325, 83d Congress, to provide for an increase of \$4,372,000 in construction authorized for the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs, Colo. The items to be constructed with this increased authorization consist of roadway facilities, erosion control and landscaping, and diesel fuel storage.

At the present time construction of the permanent Academy is 69 percent complete. Of the \$122,234,548 under contract \$78,049,000 worth of work is in place. The total amount authorized and funded to date is approximately \$135.5 million.

REAL ESTATE

The Air Force seeks authorization in this program to acquire various identified interests in 4,491 acres of land, all inside the United States, at a cost of \$1,341,000. These land interests are required primarily to extend runways at existing installations; to develop facilities for the guided missile programs; to establish clearances for flight safety in runway approach zones; to provide safety clearances for weapons storage facilities; and to expand operational and support facilities. In addition, certain real-estate interests, not yet firmly delineated, will be acquired under the authorizations requested for the missile programs. No withdrawals from the public domain are requested. The following table summarizes the identified land items in the program:

Land interests in Air Force, fiscal year 1959 military construction authorization

Interest	Acres	Cost
Fee purchase.....	1,555	\$1,163,000
Restrictive easement.....	1,680	8,000
Clearance easement.....	1,017	74,000
Right-of-way easement.....	239	96,000
Total.....	4,491	1,341,000

DISPOSAL OF REAL PROPERTY

The Air Force is continuing its policy to acquire only that land needed for present and immediately foreseeable operations and to relinquish lands for which continued requirements are not foreseen. During calendar year 1957, the Air Force issued directives to dispose of 1,165,060 acres of land and 253,333 square feet of space in buildings in the United States. A summation of disposals by type follows: (1) Land returned to public domain, 29,606 acres. (2) Government-owned land, with improvements, 2,262 acres. This land will be returned to the tax rolls, resulting in increased revenue for the communities concerned. Further, the sale of this property results in certain moneys being deposited in the Treasury of the United States. (3) Leases canceled, 17,389 acres of land, and 253,333 square feet of space in buildings. Cancellation of these leases results in reductions of \$689,152 per annum in lease costs, as well as considerable reductions in annual maintenance costs. (4) Lesser interests, such as easements and permits, which were canceled or otherwise disposed of totaled 1,115,803 acres.

UNFORESEEN CONSTRUCTION

Twenty-five million dollars of authorization is requested in this bill for construction of unforeseen projects, without identification to specific construction items or locations. This authorization will provide the Secretary of the Air Force authority to construct urgently required facilities for which requirements are not now known or firm, but which must be initiated prior to the next military construction authorization act.

Changing international conditions and operational concepts, changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, improved production schedules, and new or unforeseen research and development re-

quirements often create new and additional facility requirements on which construction must be initiated promptly and provided in short periods of time in order that the weapons and systems may be effectively utilized at the earliest possible dates or by specified requirement dates. With present rapidly advancing enemy capabilities and United States technology, it is imperative that construction be provided where needed to support the introduction of new developments in weapons systems and operational concepts. For the same reason, it is not always possible to accurately and fully foresee all such requirements in time to include them in the normal annual military construction program which would eliminate the need for emergency actions to produce the facilities by the time required.

Public Law 968, 84th Congress (fiscal year 1957 program) provided the Secretary of the Air Force with \$50 million of this type of emergency construction authorization. Approximately \$44 million of this authorization has been utilized and the Armed Services Committees of the Congress so notified, and an additional \$4 million is in various stages of processing for initiation of construction in fiscal year 1958. In view of recent developments and the continuing acceleration of defense programs, it is anticipated that the balance of the Air Force available authorization for unforeseen construction will be fully utilized prior to the end of fiscal year 1958.

TITLE IV

This title would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish or develop installations or facilities for advanced research projects and certain air defense missile facilities as previously covered in this report. In connection with the exercise of this authority, the Secretary or his designee is authorized to acquire or construct facilities, acquire land, prepare sites, and engage in other similar activities. The title authorizes \$233,372,000 for these purposes. The committee inserted language which requires the Secretary of Defense to report to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives semiannually with respect to the exercise of this authority.

ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY

On February 7, 1958, the Secretary of Defense issued a directive which gives to the Advanced Research Projects Agency the responsibility for planning and directing advanced research projects involving space science and technology, ballistic missile defense and other advanced research and development as assigned from time to time by the Secretary.

The Advanced Research Projects Agency was organized to provide for the Department of Defense expedited and forward-looking research programs which in the past have been retarded by the necessity for a formal military requirement. The organization of the Agency is in recognition of the importance of pushing advanced research which may have military applications even before it is known whether the results will be fruitful and how any results achieved may be used.

By utilizing existing facilities of the military departments, other Government agencies, universities, and industry, it is believed that the Advanced Research Projects Agency can effectively carry out its responsibilities with a small staff of about 20 staff assistants, together

with the necessary clerical and stenographic support. In addition, arrangements have been made for the Institute for Defense Analyses to provide scientific and technical assistance with about 25 scientists. In the future it is anticipated additional contracts with universities and industry for studies and management-type activities.

The committee was informed that it is not intended to expand to a large organization that will require extensive laboratories, although there probably will be some modifications to existing facility complexes to keep from impairing effort which must be directed to more immediate development of weapons systems. The Advanced Research Projects Agency will work closely, in fact already is, with other elements of the Federal Government that are concerned with science and its application to national security. The Agency is working closely with other elements of the Department of Defense, with the National Academy of Sciences, the National Science Foundation, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which, under the President's plan, will become the National Aeronautics and Space Agency.

While present plans do not contemplate construction of Advanced Research Projects Agency laboratories, need is foreseen for special-purpose facilities to prove out radically new concepts. In fact, approximately one-half of the authorization being requested is for a single classified project of this type of the highest priority.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

These follow the pattern established in prior military construction acts, and a description of each is outlined below:

Section 501

This section is general authorizing language which has appeared for several years in military construction bills. It will be noted that the authorities granted may be exercised without regard to certain sections of the Revised Statutes and two sections of title 10, United States Code. The laws which will have no application to the construction authorized by this bill are as follows:

Section 3648 of the Revised Statutes as found in title 31, United States Code, section 529, provides in part as follows:

No advance of public money shall be made in any case unless authorized by the appropriation concerned or other law. And in all cases of contracts for the performance of any service, or the delivery of articles of any description for the use of the United States, payment shall not exceed the value of the service rendered, or of the articles delivered previously to such payment.

There are situations in connection with public-works projects where it may be necessary to advance money prior to the actual receipt of the service or the property to be obtained. For example, where utilities such as power, gas, or water lines are required to be installed and it is necessary for a private utility company to extend its lines to the military installation, the military department oftentimes must pay for the costs of such extension. These payments are eventually recouped by deductions from the periodic payments made for the service to the utility company. However, in the strict sense, such

initial payment for installation costs are advance payments for the service rendered.

In regard to that part of Revised Statutes 3734 as found in title 40, United States Code, section 259, the committee feels that the key to the analysis of that provision are the words "specifically appropriated therefor." It will be noted that the bill permits a 5-percent (United States) and 10-percent (overseas) variation for projects authorized by the bill in order to provide necessary elasticity. It is entirely possible that this elasticity would be lost were the construction subject to this section of the Revised Statutes.

With respect to the second part of Revised Statutes 3734 found in title 40, United States Code, section 267, regarding the making by the General Services of sketch plans, outline descriptions, and detailed estimates of the cost of any public building, it is not believed that such was intended nor should apply to the varied and multitudinous projects authorized by the military construction authorization acts. Such a requirement would place a great administrative burden on the General Services Administration which could only result in serious delay.

Section 9774 (d), title 10, United States Code:

(d) Except when built by members of the Air Force, no permanent barrack, quarters, building, or other permanent structure may be built unless a detailed estimate of its cost has been submitted to Congress and a specific appropriation has been made therefor. No one may build such a structure without specific authority of Congress if the cost is more than \$100,000.

It is pointed out that detailed estimates of cost are not available in many cases until the project has been authorized by Congress and an architect and engineering contract has been let and performed.

It will be noted also that the authority granted by this section may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes. This provision of law provides in pertinent part as follows:

Section 355, Revised Statutes:

No public money shall be expended upon any site or land purchased by the United States for the purposes of erecting thereon any armory, arsenal, fort, fortification, navy yard, customhouse, lighthouse, or other public building of any kind whatever, until the written opinion of the Attorney General shall be had in favor of the validity of the title * * *.

It should be clearly understood that the exception from the requirement that title to land be approved by the Attorney General prior to the exercise of the authorities granted in this bill does not mean that the opinion of the Attorney General will not be obtained. It means merely that urgent construction can proceed prior to the rendering of such an opinion by him.

Sections 502 and 503

These sections relate merely to totals in the bill and percentage variations allowable in the cost of projects and repeat similar provisions in Public Law 241, 85th Congress.

Section 504

This section authorizes the use of existing unused authorization for family housing under previous Military Construction Authorization Acts (Public Law 765, 83d Cong.; Public Law 161, 84th Cong.; and Public Law 968, 84th Cong.) to provide family housing at those installations for which appropriated fund family housing authorization is requested in this bill.

Section 505

Section 505 provides that whenever the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, would interfere with the authorizations granted for construction in foreign countries, and the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for auditing contracts for this construction, the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section. The provision of law referred to is as follows:

Section 2313 (b), title 10, United States Code:

(b) Each contract negotiated under this chapter shall provide that the Comptroller General and his representatives are entitled, until the expiration of three years after final payment, to examine any books, documents, papers, or records of the contractor, or any of his subcontractors, that directly pertain to, and involve transactions relating to, the contract or subcontract.

Section 506

This section relates to the awarding of contracts on a competitive basis, and to the requirement that the military department shall report to the Congress with respect to contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis. The first of the laws referred to is the Armed Services Procurement Act. The second law referred to, which is self-explanatory, is as follows:

Section 15 of the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547, 551):

SEC. 15. Section 3 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

“(c) All bids or invitations for bids shall contain in their specifications all the necessary language and material required and shall be so descriptive both in its language and attachments thereto in order to permit full and free competition. Any bid or invitation to bid which shall not carry the necessary descriptive language and attachments thereto, or if such attachments are not available or accessible to all competent, reliable bidders, such bid or invitation to bid shall be invalid and any award or awards made to any bidder in such case shall be invalidated and rejected.”

In addition, this section which is similar to sections contained in previous construction bills, has been reworded to provide that all awards made by the United States under the provisions of this act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army or of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense, in special cases, determines otherwise. (See p. 55, Competitive bid procedures.)

Section 507

This section advances for 2 years the general rescission provisions now contained in section 506 of Public Law 241, 85th Congress. This continues in effect the established policy of repealing long-standing military construction authorizations that have not been used by the military departments. As a result, after July 1, 1959, only those authorizations, with certain specified exceptions, which are contained in public laws enacted subsequent to August 3, 1956, would continue to be available. Under this section, unused authorization that has been in effect 3 years will be automatically rescinded.

Section 508

This section would repeal section 408 (b) of Public Law 564, 81st Congress, which directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Congress, at the beginning of the first session of each Congress, all military construction authorization enacted since the 80th Congress, for which adequate funds have not been appropriated, and to recommend to the Congress which portions of this unused authorization should be rescinded.

Under present procedures, the amount of all residual unfunded authorization is always reported to Congress by the Department of Defense in its presentation of the annual MCA bill. Therefore, as this information is now reported annually, the requirement for a biennial report, as specified by Public Law 564, would appear unnecessary.

In view of the provisions of section 507 of this bill, under which all unused authorization that has been in effect 3 years is automatically rescinded, there is no longer any need to recommend biennially unused authorization to Congress for rescission. Moreover, under present program management procedures, large accumulations of unused authorizations are no longer allowed to occur.

Section 509

This section would extend through fiscal year 1961, the previously enacted leasing authority for housing at tactical installations, so that NIKE and other tactical site housing requirements may be met by utilizing existing private housing to the greatest possible extent, thereby reducing the necessity for construction of military quarters.

Section 510

Section 510 would amend section 406 of Public Law 968, 84th Congress, which authorizes land acquisition projects not exceeding \$5,000, to authorize a new limit of \$25,000 for each land acquisition project. In addition, the restriction of this section to projects which are urgently required has been eliminated. These changes are desired in order to better carry out the original intent of section 406, Public Law 968/84, which was to expedite the handling of small real estate acquisition projects, and to reduce the administrative workload involved in these small transactions.

Section 511

This section would add a new subsection to section 408 (a) of Public Law 968, 84th Congress, which would exempt small, routine construction projects costing \$5,000 or less from the present requirement that a determination be made that they are urgently required. The committee found that this method of handling these minor, low-cost con-

struction projects requires an excessive amount of administration and delay which would be eliminated by the change proposed in section 511.

Section 512

This section would amend section 406 of Public Law 241, 85th Congress, so as to exempt two additional categories of family housing from the present requirement for inclusion in the annual military construction authorization act. The reasons for the specific exemptions in this section are as follows:

(1) Mandatory Wherry acquisition projects were exempted from the requirement for inclusion in the annual military construction authorization act by Public Law 241, 85th Congress.

(2) Leased housing is proposed to be exempted because such housing, if acquired at all, must be acquired on short notice as the housing becomes available. It would be impractical to plan such acquisitions sufficiently far in advance to permit annual line item authorization.

In addition, the acquisition of "permissive" Wherry projects would be exempted from the requirement. This is consistent with prior committee recommendations that Department of Defense proceed to acquire all Wherry housing projects for which there is a long-range military requirement at permanent installations.

Section 513

The committee added four new provisions to section 513. They are:

(1) Limits the number of family housing units to be constructed overseas to a total of 4,000 units out of surplus commodity funds.

(2) Limits the number of Capehart family housing units to be constructed during fiscal year 1959, to a total of 30,000.

(3) Provides some elasticity in the siting of Capehart housing in order to insure that if an urgent requirement arises in a location which was not designated by a line item, that another less urgent project can be deferred or others could be lessened in number of units in order to provide housing for the new site.

(4) Provided as previously mentioned for clarification in the acquisition of Wherry housing projects by condemnation.

Section 514

Contains similar restrictions on unit costs as those provided in last year's bill. The only difference is that certain increases are provided in order to meet increased costs.

The committee is disturbed by an inexorable advance in the cost of personnel facilities, such as barracks and bachelor officers' quarters. Despite the unit cost limitations which have been imposed by this committee and the uniform design criteria established by the Office, Secretary of Defense, there has been a marked upward cost trend, beyond a level which can be justifiably attributed to current market conditions. Although the committee acknowledges the morale and welfare contribution good living quarters provide, it seems reasonable to expect that pleasant, livable accommodations, commensurate with civilian standards can be obtained within present statutory limitations

through good planning, efficient and economical use of materials, centralized plumbing facilities, and careful selection of all mechanical equipment for optimum installation and operating economy.

While as mentioned before the committee went along with the Department of Defense recommendation that cost limitations on bachelor officers' quarters be raised from \$7,500 to \$8,500, the committee takes this action with the specific and definite understanding that the \$8,500 limitation will be completely adhered to without exception.

Section 515

Provides that titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1958."

Section 516

Merely extends the date by 2 years (from July 1960 to July 1962) upon which substandard quarters must be disposed of if they have not been rehabilitated in that time.

TITLE VI

RESERVE COMPONENT FACILITIES

The National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 (Public Law 783, 81st Cong.) authorized the acquisition and construction of facilities for the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, which authorization was amended by Public Law 302 of the 84th Congress and Public Law 85-215. Permanent provisions of the foregoing law have been codified in chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, or are included in pending amendments thereto.

Title VI of the proposed legislation would provide specific line-item project authorization for fiscal year 1959, together with certain other provisions necessary to effect the transition from the general authorization heretofore granted by the Congress to the line-item type required for future programs.

Title VI of the proposed legislation is premised upon retention of the provisions of chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, to the fullest extent compatible with the expressed intent of the Congress. The only substantive amendment of that chapter would be the deletion of the requirement for "consultation" with the Armed Services Committees with respect to the projects to be undertaken by the Secretary of Defense, and substitution therefor of a provision requiring authorization by law of specific projects, with certain exceptions.

Title VI would have authorized specific projects for the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Air Force Reserve and the Air National Guard. Additional authorization was not requested by the Department of Defense for the Army Reserve and Army National Guard inasmuch as it was the Department of Defense position that projects heretofore authorized and appropriated for, but remaining unconstructed, were sufficient in number to cover the approved obligation program of construction during fiscal year 1959 for both of these Reserve components.

The committee takes a contrary position and as discussed before, added line item projects for the Army National Guard and Army Reserve.

Title VI would also continue the authorizations previously granted for those facilities which have been the subject of consultation with the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives before July 1, 1958, provided they are placed under construction contract before July 1, 1960 and are funded from appropriations made prior to enactment of the proposed legislation.

As has been stated the committee could not agree with the Department of Defense that the best interests of the Reserve components would be served by failing to authorize additional projects for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve. It is true that the Army National Guard presently has \$17.7 million funded and unobligated authorization as of June 30, 1958 and that the Army Reserve has \$30.8 million funded and unobligated authorization as of the same date. However, these unobligated authorizations exist only because the Department of Defense has not permitted these two Reserve components to obligate these authorizations. As of consequence, the Army Reserve and Army National Guard have fallen behind the other Reserve components in their Reserve facilities construction program. It is a fact that in all the Reserve components the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve have the greatest need for additional training facilities. The National Guard Bureau estimates that of the total requirement of 2,780 armories there still is a deficiency of 764 armories to be built before the Army National Guard can complete its program. Of the total Army Reserve requirement of 1,800 Reserve training centers only 717 have been constructed, leaving a deficiency of 1,083.

Insofar as the Army National Guard is concerned there is also for consideration the amount of funds which have been appropriated by the State legislatures. There is presently in excess of \$35 million available in State funds as matching contributions for the construction of Army National Guard armories. The committee believes that the States have more than done their part under the provisions of the law for providing the necessary State funds and the Federal Government should now provide matching funds so that the Army National Guard construction program can proceed and keep pace with the other Reserve components.

As a consequence the committee added projects for both the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard totaling \$28,330,000.

The total amount recommended by the committee for Reserve component construction is \$57,201,000. This exceeds the original Department of Defense proposal by \$28,285,000. Even so, the committee believes this to be a modest authorization when the need for Reserve facilities is considered. Furthermore, it should be remembered that in fiscal year 1958 the Congress authorized \$80 million for Reserve facilities construction, and thus the authorization for fiscal year 1959 is less than one-half the amount authorized for fiscal year 1958.

BACKGROUND OF THE BASIC LAW

Prior to World War II, our Reserves were relatively small. In the various States the National Guard was geared to the requirements of

the States concerned rather than into a pattern for mobilization requirements in the event of total war. Since the war it has been a matter of almost constant discussion as to how large a Reserve should be maintained.

Until the enactment of the basic law, one of the most important limiting factors in developing the Reserve was the lack of proper armories and other facilities needed for training purposes. That law has gone a long way in correcting this deficiency, but there is still a long road to travel before the deficiency is met. The law gave an impetus to the Reserve program which cannot be overestimated. Upon the enactment of the law the civilian Reserve components felt that they were no longer a forgotten group. It provided a spur and an encouragement which has manifested itself in infinitely more interest in the Reserve program than had ever before been experienced.

Prior to the enactment of the basic law, the Federal Government paid for the construction of armories for its Reserves, but it had never contributed to the construction of armories for the National Guard, on the basis that such construction was the responsibility of the States. Public Law 783, 81st Congress, provided authority for the Secretary of Defense to continue the construction of facilities for Reserves other than National Guard, and in addition made provision that the Secretary could contribute to any State the entire cost necessary to expand, rehabilitate or convert existing National Guard facilities so as to provide joint facilities which could then be used by the National Guard and other Reserve components. Section 3 (c) of that law provided that the Secretary could contribute to any State a portion of the funds for construction or expansion of armories where the need for such had been brought about by the expansion of the National Guard or the Air National Guard of the United States in order to meet Federal requirements. Such contributions are limited to 75 percent of the total cost, the States to provide the land necessary in addition to their 25 percent contribution.

The original law provided in part, that the Secretary of Defense might acquire reserve facilities, by construction or otherwise, over a period of 5 fiscal years and might have appropriated during that time not to exceed \$250 million. In 1955 Public Law 302, 84th Congress, extended that time limitation for an additional 3 years and increased the authorization by another \$250 million. In 1957 Public Law 85-215 again increased the authorization by another \$80 million but retained the time limitation as previously established; viz, through June 30, 1958.

Provision was also made in the law for consultation with the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives in order that the committees might be kept continuously advised with respect to operations under the law.

PROGRESS OF PROGRAM TO DATE AND FUTURE REQUIREMENTS

Table 1 summarizes the utilization made of the authorization previously provided.

TABLE 1.—*Reserve Forces facilities—Utilization of authorizations and appropriations provided under the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended*

[In millions of dollars]

	Army National Guard	Army Reserve	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve	Air Force Reserve	Air National Guard	Total
Authorizations and appropriations.....	139.3	105.4	² 80.9	54.5	¹ 174.3	² 554.4
Constructed and under construction:						
Planned as of June 30, 1958.....	121.6	74.6	70.1	39.4	174.3	480.0
Actual as of Apr. 30, 1958.....	110.3	62.4	63.5	36.3	154.0	426.5
Residual authorization funded, estimated June 30, 1958.....	17.7	30.8	² 10.8	15.1	¹ 0	74.4

¹ Air National Guard funds are "1-year" and unobligated funds expire June 30.

² Does not include \$1.9 million of unobligated prior-year appropriations for which specific project authorization is contained in the proposed legislation.

Navy (aviation, surface, Marine Corps)

The Naval Reserve aviation program, which also supports Marine Corps Reserve aviation, is composed of 22 activities. Six of these are Naval Air Reserve training units situated on Regular air stations and the remainder are Reserve air stations. Foreseeable requirements to keep these activities in step with the demands of modern aircraft and associated equipment amounts to \$125 million. This includes replacement of those buildings which are deteriorated beyond economical repair, modernization of other buildings, and modernization of operations facilities.

The Naval Reserve surface program consists of 319 training centers and facilities, and 184 electronic facilities and stations. A major effort is now under way to reorganize sizable segments of the surface program into crews ready on short notice to man antisubmarine warfare ships for immediate augmentation of the fleet in an emergency. This will necessitate the providing of some berthing facilities and dockside services in conjunction with the adjacent training centers. Modernization and replacement of overage temporary buildings previously mentioned is required. The total foreseeable requirements for the Naval Reserve surface program are estimated at \$29 million.

The Marine Corps Reserve ground facilities establishment consists of 231 training centers, 163 of which are combined with the Naval Reserve training centers mentioned above. Although no additional centers are required, replacement, expansion, or modernization of some of the present facilities is urgently required. Foreseeable needs are estimated to cost about \$8 million.

Thus, there is a foreseeable requirement of \$162 million for the overall program. Of this, it is proposed to accomplish about \$15 million in fiscal year 1959.

The fiscal year 1959 authorization program as contained in the proposed legislation, includes provisions for—

- (a) Replacement of 4 training centers;
- (b) Replacement of 10 electronic facilities;
- (c) Improvements to 4 training centers and 3 ships' operations facilities;
- (d) Acquisition of 2 sites of presently used centers;
- (e) Improvements and modernization at 12 naval air stations.

In planning for this program, the principle of joint utilization is observed to the utmost, as required by law. A summary of this joint utilization follows:

- (a) All Naval Reserve aviation facilities are jointly used;
- (b) 74 percent of Naval Reserve surface training centers/facilities are jointly used;
- (c) 71 percent of Marine Corps Reserve training centers are jointly used.

Through fiscal year 1958 a total of \$83 million has been appropriated to carry out this program. To date, a little more than \$64 million has been obligated and it is expected this total will be raised to \$70 million by end fiscal year 1958.

Air Force

The established mobilization requirement of the Air Reserve Forces is 39 combat flying wings. Twenty-four of these wings, consisting of 83 combat squadrons of the fighter and tactical reconnaissance types, make up the tactical force of the Air National Guard and there are 15 medium troop carrier wings of 45 tactical squadrons in the Air Force Reserve.

In addition, there are 157 support type units of the Air Reserve and Air National Guard which have been programed to meet specific mobilization requirements in the fields of communications, weather, air resupply, air evacuation, terminal operations, air rescue, and hospital type units.

The Air National Guard operates 93 flying bases and 41 nonflying bases. Construction plans for fiscal year 1959 and future years do not contemplate establishing any new bases except Bethel, Minn., under present programs, missions, and aircraft assignment. Certain construction is necessary to complete some of the newer facilities; to replace World War II temporary construction; to expand facilities, particularly runways, taxiways, and aprons to accommodate higher performance aircraft being received; and to complete the program of providing flight simulator and rocket storage buildings, which only recently became a requirement of the program as advanced model jet aircraft are received. To summarize, the conversion of a World War II temporary base structure to a modernized plant capable of operating Century series jets will, over a period of 15 years, require about \$254 million of construction which should be approximately 80 percent complete this year, assuming the entire amount in progress this year gets under contract.

For the Air Force Reserve, \$54.5 million has been funded under the authorization provided through fiscal year 1958. The facilities provided through the expenditure of these funds has contributed immeasurably to the attainment of the high degree of combat capability which exists in our Reserve troop carrier units today. Of the 37

lying bases required to support our flying units, 34 are now in operation with a good percentage of the minimum operational facilities required having been provided. The remaining three bases required are now under construction and will be completed during fiscal year 1959. To round out all facilities needed at the flying bases of the Air Force Reserve will require approximately \$29 million after fiscal year 1959. Five Air Reserve centers (nonflying) have been constructed, 1 is under construction, and 1 is programmed from currently available funds. No additional centers are planned for construction at this time since priority will still continue to be given to the construction of the facilities required for our flying units. Once this construction has been accomplished, reviews will be made of individual locations and, where it is determined that such construction meets the best interests of the Government, action will be taken to include these centers in a future construction program.

Army Reserve and National Guard

Since 1951, the Army has had appropriated to it \$244.7 million, of which \$139.2 million represents contributions made, or to be made, to the States for the National Guard armory and nonarmory programs, and \$105.4 million represents facilities for the Army Reserve.

In the National Guard armory program 916 of the 2,089 armories constructed by the States without Federal assistance represent adequate facilities for continued use, against a total requirement of 2,250 armories as estimated by the Department of the Army; the States and the National Guard Bureau, however, estimate total requirements as 2,780 armories. These estimates remain to be reconciled upon completion of the new troop unit program under the "Pentomic Division" organizational structure, and the revised plan of distribution of these units throughout the States. A total of 1,100 armories have been constructed, are under construction, or are funded within \$115 million of the total appropriations heretofore made available for the National Guard. Thus the remaining requirement for National Guard armories will range between 234 and 764 upon completion of the revised troop unit program by the Department of the Army. Approximately \$24 million of the total appropriations heretofore made available for the National Guard represent nonarmory facilities (maintenance shops, supply, and administrative facilities) which have been constructed, are under construction, or are programmed for early initiation.

In the Army Reserve center program 332 of the 1,783 facilities acquired by lease or donation, and now in use, represent facilities adequate for continued use, against an estimated total requirement of 1,800 centers. A total of 385 centers have been constructed, are under construction, or are funded within the \$105.4 million appropriations heretofore made available for Army Reserve construction. Thus the remaining requirement for Army Reserve centers is estimated at 1,083 centers, representing a future authorization and funding requirement of \$235 million. This requirement, also, may be subject to revision upon completion of the new troop unit program under the "Pentomic Division" organizational structure, and the revised plan of distribution of these Army Reserve units throughout the States.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment into law of this proposed legislation will involve the initial expenditure of \$1,644,641,000; of this amount \$57,246,000 representing Reserve components construction.

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

This measure is part of the legislative program of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1959 and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget in its original form as is evidenced by letter dated May 1, 1958, from Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy and by letter dated May 1, 1958, from Deputy Secretary of Defense Donald A. Quarles, which are set out below and made a part of this report.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 1, 1958.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1958, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to its presentation to the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted.

This proposed legislation would authorize additional military construction that is urgently needed by the Department of Defense at this time, and would provide additional authority to cover deficiencies in prior construction authorizations. The appropriation of money required for construction is provided for in the budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year 1959.

This legislation consists of titles I, II, III, and IV, covering authorization required by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the Department of Defense, respectively; and title V covering general provisions relating to this legislation.

This proposal would authorize new construction totaling \$1,684,361,000, of which \$347,028,000 is for the Department of the Army; \$301,062,000 is for the Department of the Navy; \$986,271,000 is for the Department of the Air Force; and \$50 million is for the Department of Defense. This proposal would also provide additional monetary authority to correct deficiencies in authorization for projects authorized under previous laws totaling \$47,238,000, of which \$13,630,000 is for the Army; \$15,825,000 is for the Navy; and \$17,783,000 is for the Air Force. Therefore, the total in this proposed legislation of new authorization plus additional monetary authority for projects previously authorized amounts to \$1,731,599,000.

This proposal would also repeal as of July 1, 1959, all authorizations, with certain exceptions, for military construction that are contained in laws enacted prior to August 4, 1956. This repeal will continue in effect the policy established in the fiscal year 1956 Military Construction Authorization Act (Public Law 161, 84th Cong.) and continued in the fiscal year 1957 and 1958 acts, of repealing long-standing authority that has not been exercised by the military departments. It is believed that the continuation of this policy will result

in a construction program which will reflect more accurately the current needs of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

NEIL McELROY.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 1, 1958.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation to provide additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, together with a sectional analysis thereof.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1958, and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 (Public Law 783, 81st Cong.) authorized the acquisition and construction of facilities for the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, which authorization was amended by Public Law 302 of the 84th Congress and Public Law 85-215. Permanent provisions of the foregoing legislation have been codified in chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, or are included in pending amendments thereto.

Report No. 696, House of Representatives, 85th Congress, 1st session, based on hearings before the Committee on Armed Services preceding enactment of Public Law 85-215, stated that sufficient increase in the general authorization for facilities for the Reserve components would be provided for fiscal year 1958, but that thereafter "the Department of Defense should request annual authorizations on a line-item basis." The proposed legislation would provide such specific project authorization for fiscal year 1959, together with certain other provisions necessary to effect the transition from the general authorization heretofore granted by the Congress to the line-item type required for future programs.

The proposed legislation is premised upon retention of the provisions of chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, to the fullest extent compatible with the expressed intent of the Congress. The only substantive amendment of that chapter would be the deletion of the requirement for "consultation" with the Armed Services Committees with respect to the projects to be undertaken by the Secretary of Defense, and substitution therefor of a provision requiring authorization by law of specific projects, with certain exceptions.

The proposed legislation would authorize specific projects for the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard. Additional authorization is not requested for the Army Reserve and Army National Guard inasmuch as projects heretofore authorized and appropriated for, but remaining unconstructed, are sufficient in number to cover the approved obli-

tion program of construction during fiscal year 1959 for both of these Reserve components.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposed legislation would authorize the appropriation of funds for specific line items in the amount of \$11,892,000 for the Department of the Navy; \$6,272,000 for the Air Force Reserve; and \$11,976,000 for the Air National Guard of the United States, of which \$8 million is included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1959 for the Department of the Navy, an undetermined amount not exceeding \$6,272,000 for the Air Force Reserve, and \$9,600,000 for the Air National Guard of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD A. QUARLES.

STATE SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1959 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM FOR ACTIVE, RESERVE, AND NATIONAL
GUARD FORCES

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Alabama-----	\$12, 871, 000
Army:	
Redstone Arsenal-----	8, 529, 000
Fort McClellan-----	174, 000
Fort Rucker-----	2, 406, 000
Air Force:	
Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile-----	975, 000
Craig Air Force Base, Selma-----	400, 000
Army National Guard:	
Ashford-----	70, 000
Bridgeport-----	70, 000
Air Force Reserve: Bates Field, Mobile-----	97, 000
Air National Guard: Birmingham Municipal Airport-----	150, 000
Arizona-----	24, 958, 000
Army:	
Fort Huachuca-----	9, 098, 000
Yuma Test Station-----	173, 000
Navy: Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma-----	8, 946, 000
Air Force:	
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson-----	4, 174, 000
Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix-----	441, 000
Williams Air Force Base, Chandler-----	1, 361, 000
Air National Guard: Sky Harbor Airport, Phoenix-----	655, 000
Army National Guard:	
Phoenix-----	65, 000
Yuma-----	45, 000
Arkansas-----	5, 422, 000
Air Force:	
Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville-----	1, 654, 000
Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock-----	3, 463, 000
Army National Guard:	
Berryville-----	45, 000
Little Rock-----	260, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

California.....	\$91, 157, 000
Army: Fort Ord.....	4, 733, 000
Navy:	
Naval Air Station, Alameda.....	114, 000
Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow.....	280, 000
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton.....	5, 138, 000
Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake.....	129, 000
Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord.....	2, 517, 000
Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona.....	510, 000
Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing.....	47, 000
Naval Air Station, Lemoore.....	15, 823, 000
Naval Shipyard, Long Beach.....	6, 000, 000
Naval Air Station, North Island.....	7, 000, 000
Naval Supply Center, Oakland.....	146, 000
Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu.....	13, 841, 000
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego.....	206, 000
Naval Training Center, San Diego.....	4, 199, 000
Naval Shipyard, San Francisco.....	766, 000
Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana.....	2, 158, 000
Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms.....	241, 000
Air Force:	
Beale Air Force Base, Marysville.....	7, 868, 000
Castle Air Force Base, Merced.....	4, 183, 000
Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc.....	981, 000
George Air Force Base, Victorville.....	536, 000
March Air Force Base, Riverside.....	3, 344, 000
Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento.....	1, 213, 000
McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento.....	1, 560, 000
Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino.....	658, 000
Oxnard Air Force Base, Oxnard.....	122, 000
Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield.....	2, 997, 000
Army National Guard:	
Culver City.....	38, 000
Fontana.....	105, 000
Hollister.....	105, 000
San Fernando.....	115, 000
San Rafael.....	115, 000
Ventura.....	115, 000
Army Reserve:	
Salinas.....	164, 000
Stockton.....	164, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve:	
Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos.....	1, 992, 000
Naval and Marine Corps Training Center, Alameda.....	128, 000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Jose.....	78, 000
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Hayward.....	99, 000
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Port Chicago.....	94, 000
Naval Reserve Training Center, Pasadena.....	295, 000
Air National Guard:	
Hayward Municipal Airport.....	113, 000
Ontario International Airport.....	127, 000
Colorado.....	1, 514, 000
Army: Fitzsimons Army Hospital.....	862, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Air Station, Denver.....	652, 000
Connecticut.....	2, 767, 000
Navy: Naval Submarine Base, New London.....	2, 247, 000
Air Force Reserve: Bradley Field, Windsor Locks.....	160, 000
Army National Guard: New London.....	360, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Delaware.....	\$2, 874, 000
Air Force: Dover Air Force Base, Dover.....	2, 874, 000
District of Columbia.....	842, 000
Navy:	
Naval Research Laboratory.....	192, 000
Naval receiving station.....	650, 000
Florida.....	43, 373, 000
Navy:	
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field.....	1, 252, 000
Naval Air Station, Jacksonville.....	74, 000
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport.....	9, 892, 000
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field.....	4, 679, 000
Naval outlying field, Whitehouse Field.....	142, 000
Air Force:	
Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso.....	10, 109, 000
Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead.....	1, 489, 000
MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa.....	3, 577, 000
McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando.....	5, 137, 000
Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa.....	2, 884, 000
Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City.....	3, 992, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Reserve Training Center, St. Petersburg.....	26, 000
Army National Guard: Gainesville.....	120, 000
Georgia.....	24, 786, 000
Army: Fort Benning.....	3, 454, 000
Air Force:	
Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta.....	172, 000
Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah.....	4, 493, 000
Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta.....	5, 432, 000
Robins Air Force Base, Macon.....	4, 362, 000
Turner Air Force Base, Albany.....	5, 474, 000
Army National Guard:	
Atlanta.....	132, 000
Calhoun.....	110, 000
Eatonton.....	90, 000
Marietta.....	90, 000
Quitman.....	90, 000
Reynolds.....	90, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta.....	480, 000
Air National Guard: Travis Field, Savannah.....	317, 000
Idaho.....	1, 295, 000
Air Force: Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home.....	1, 039, 000
Army National Guard:	
Jerome.....	52, 000
Preston.....	57, 000
Rigby.....	57, 000
Twin Falls.....	90, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Illinois-----	\$4, 666, 000
Army: Rock Island Arsenal-----	570, 000
Navy: Naval Training Center, Great Lakes-----	1, 368, 000
Air Force:	
Scott Air Force Base, Belleville-----	423, 000
Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul-----	640, 000
Army Reserve: Galesburg-----	157, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve:	
Naval Air Station, Glenview-----	179, 000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Moline-----	152, 000
Air National Guard:	
Capital Airport, Springfield-----	78, 000
O'Hare International Airport, Chicago-----	1, 099, 000
Indiana-----	12, 236, 000
Army: Fort Benjamin Harrison-----	783, 000
Air Force: Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru-----	7, 996, 000
Army National Guard: Valparaiso-----	188, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Bloomington-----	95, 000
Air Force Reserve: Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus-----	3, 174, 000
Iowa-----	445, 000
Army National Guard:	
Camp Dodge-----	80, 000
Camp Dodge-----	120, 000
Storm Lake-----	95, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Iowa City-----	97, 000
Air National Guard: Des Moines Municipal Airport-----	53, 000
Kansas-----	9, 997, 000
Army:	
Fort Leavenworth-----	1, 076, 000
Fort Riley-----	1, 084, 000
Air Force:	
Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka-----	2, 703, 000
McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita-----	2, 119, 000
Schilling Air Force Base, Salina-----	2, 352, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Air Station, Olathe-----	570, 000
Army National Guard: Yates Center-----	93, 000
Kentucky-----	2, 292, 000
Army:	
Fort Campbell-----	847, 000
Fort Knox-----	516, 000
Army National Guard: Middleboro-----	130, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Reserve Electronics Fac- ility, Danville-----	84, 000
Air National Guard: Standiford Field, Louisville-----	715, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Louisiana-----	\$10,639,000
Air Force:	
Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport-----	3,355,000
Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles-----	3,401,000
Army National Guard:	
Camp Beauregard-----	279,000
Camp Beauregard No. 2-----	325,000
Naval and Marine Reserve:	
Naval Air Station (Alvin Callender), New Orleans-----	2,447,000
Communications Facility, New Orleans-----	210,000
Air Force Reserve: Naval Air Station (Alvin Callender), New Orleans-----	622,000
Maine-----	57,014,000
Navy: Naval Radio Station, Washington County-----	38,654,000
Air Force:	
Brunswick Naval Air Station, Brunswick-----	11,417,000
Dow Air Force Base, Bangor-----	2,404,000
Loring Air Force Base, Limestone-----	3,774,000
Army National Guard:	
Augusta-----	90,000
Belfast-----	75,000
Brunswick-----	75,000
Gardiner-----	75,000
Millinocket-----	75,000
Portland-----	75,000
Saco-----	150,000
South Portland-----	150,000
Maryland-----	68,590,000
Army:	
Aberdeen Proving Ground-----	2,697,000
Army Chemical Center-----	2,051,000
Army Map Service-----	1,913,000
Fort Detrick-----	795,000
Fort Meade-----	498,000
Fort Ritchie-----	43,000
Navy:	
Naval Air Facility, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs-----	17,666,000
Naval Academy, Annapolis-----	14,200,000
National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda-----	8,503,000
Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak-----	601,000
Air Force: Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs-----	18,937,000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Reserve Training Center, White Oak-----	557,000
Air Force Reserve: Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs--	129,000
Massachusetts-----	8,099,000
Army: Fort Devens-----	171,000
Navy: Naval Ammunition Depot, Hingham-----	694,000
Air Force:	
Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford-----	165,000
Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth-----	3,689,000
Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls-----	945,000
Army National Guard:	
Agawam-----	170,000
Boston-----	270,000
Saugus-----	210,000
South Boston-----	360,000
Whitman-----	170,000
Naval and Marine Reserve:	
Naval Air Station, South Weymouth-----	407,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Boston-----	108,000
Air National Guard: Barnes Field, Westfield-----	740,000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Michigan-----	\$40, 236, 000
Army: Detroit Arsenal-----	5, 666, 000
Air Force:	
Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie-----	9, 948, 000
K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette-----	10, 673, 000
Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens-----	3, 579, 000
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda-----	8, 696, 000
Army National Guard: Sturgis-----	220, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile----	147, 000
Air National Guard:	
Alpena County Airport, Alpena-----	171, 000
Kellogg Field, Battle Creek-----	1, 136, 000
Minnesota-----	3, 441, 000
Air Force: Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth-----	2, 649, 000
Army National Guard:	
Duluth-----	37, 000
Minneapolis-----	88, 000
Northwest St. Paul-----	130, 000
Stillwater-----	37, 000
Air National Guard: Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel--	500, 000
Mississippi-----	17, 776, 000
Navy: Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian-----	14, 940, 000
Air Force:	
Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus-----	1, 939, 000
Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville-----	208, 000
Army National Guard:	
Ackerman-----	54, 000
Batesville-----	54, 000
Camp Shelby-----	165, 000
Ocean Springs-----	54, 000
Air National Guard: Gulfport Municipal Airport, Gulfport--	362, 000
Missouri-----	8, 456, 000
Air Force:	
Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City-----	2, 799, 000
Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster-----	5, 185, 000
Air Force Reserve: Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Belton--	101, 000
Air National Guard: Rosecrans Field, St. Joseph-----	123, 000
Army National Guard:	
Fredericktown-----	135, 000
Jefferson City-----	113, 000
Montana-----	12, 631, 000
Air Force:	
Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow-----	10, 659, 000
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls-----	1, 832, 000
Army National Guard:	
Culbertson-----	73, 000
Kalispell-----	67, 000
Nebraska-----	7, 630, 000
Air Force:	
Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln-----	4, 250, 000
Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha-----	3, 265, 000
Army National Guard: Wahoo-----	115, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Nevada-----	\$1, 652, 000
Army: Camp Desert Rock-----	374, 000
Navy: Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon-----	80, 000
Air Force:	
Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas-----	358, 000
Stead Air Force Base, Reno-----	571, 000
Air National Guard: Hubbard Field, Reno-----	159, 000
Army National Guard: Winnemucca-----	110, 000
New Hampshire-----	1, 665, 000
Air Force: Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth-----	940, 000
Army National Guard:	
Concord-----	375, 000
Air Force Reserve: Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester-----	180, 000
Air National Guard: Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester---	170, 000
New Jersey-----	8, 411, 000
Army: Fort Dix-----	3, 749, 000
Navy: Naval Facility, Cape May-----	141, 000
Air Force: McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown-----	3, 901, 000
Army National Guard:	
Hammonton-----	175, 000
Pitman-----	175, 000
Trenton-----	80, 000
Princeton-----	175, 000
Salem-----	15, 000
New Mexico-----	19, 291, 000
Army: White Sands Proving Ground-----	7, 931, 000
Air Force:	
Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo-----	1, 650, 000
Walker Air Force Base, Roswell-----	8, 431, 000
Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque-----	481, 000
Army National Guard:	
Espanola-----	57, 000
Clayton-----	57, 000
Silver City-----	57, 000
Sorrocco-----	57, 000
Air National Guard: Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque--	570, 000
New York-----	10, 449, 000
Army: United States Military Academy-----	5, 844, 000
Air Force:	
Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome-----	1, 177, 000
Plattsburg Air Force Base, Plattsburg-----	208, 000
Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton-----	86, 000
Army National Guard:	
Saranac Lake-----	300, 000
Catskill-----	300, 000
Patchogue-----	375, 000
Smithtown-----	300, 000
Army Reserve:	
Batavia-----	171, 000
Canandaigua-----	171, 000
Hempstead-----	536, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve:	
Naval Air Station, New York-----	130, 000
Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls-----	652, 000
Naval Reserve Training Center, Dunkirk-----	79, 000
Naval Reserve Training Center, Fort Schuyler-----	120, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

North Carolina-----	\$20,906,000
Army: Fort Bragg-----	762,000
Navy:	
Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point-----	11,215,000
Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point-----	1,067,000
Marine Corps Air Facility, New River-----	1,003,000
Air Force: Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro-----	4,707,000
Army National Guard:	
Shallotte-----	95,000
Smithfield-----	98,000
Asheville-----	132,000
Belmont-----	98,000
Farmville-----	98,000
Greensboro-----	357,000
Hendersonville-----	120,000
Kannapolis-----	109,000
Lasker-Woodland-----	103,000
Laurinburg-----	105,000
Lincolnton-----	95,000
Nashville-----	98,000
Rockingham-----	98,000
Roseboro-----	98,000
Wallace-----	95,000
Camp Butner-----	353,000
North Dakota-----	7,046,000
Air Force:	
Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks-----	4,176,000
Minot Air Force Base, Minot-----	2,721,000
Army Reserve: Fargo-----	149,000
Ohio-----	35,687,000
Air Force:	
Clinton County, Air Force Base, Wilmington-----	11,589,000
Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus-----	11,716,000
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton-----	11,037,000
Army National Guard:	
Caldwell-----	135,000
Cincinnati-----	300,000
Greenville-----	165,000
Army Reserve:	
Fremont-----	149,000
St. Marys-----	149,000
Canton-----	40,000
Warren-----	289,000
Naval and Marine Reserve:	
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Chillicothe-----	100,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Steubenville-----	18,000
Oklahoma-----	17,887,000
Army: Fort Sill-----	3,227,000
Air Force:	
Altus Air Force Base, Altus-----	4,051,000
Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton-----	2,734,000
Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City-----	5,196,000
Vance Air Force Base, Enid-----	1,770,000
Army Reserve:	
Durant-----	141,000
Oklahoma City-----	443,000
Air Force Reserve: Davis Field, Muskogee-----	325,000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Oregon-----	\$623, 000
Air Force: Kingsley Air Force Base, Klamath-----	229, 000
Air National Guard: Portland International Airport-----	233, 000
Army National Guard: Salem-----	161, 000
Pennsylvania-----	7, 418, 000
Army: Carlisle Barracks-----	374, 000
Air Force:	
Olmstead Air Force Base, Middletown-----	6, 169, 000
Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta-----	94, 000
Army National Guard:	
Bethlehem-----	45, 000
Carlisle-----	45, 000
Chester-----	206, 000
Ligonier-----	45, 000
Army Reserve:	
Johnstown-----	99, 000
St. Marys-----	149, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Air Station, Willow Grove--	99, 000
Air Force Reserve: Naval Air Station, Willow Grove-----	93, 000
Rhode Island-----	4, 405, 000
Navy:	
Naval Station, Newport-----	1, 709, 000
Naval Supply Depot, Newport-----	2, 210, 000
Naval War College, Newport-----	273, 000
Air National Guard: Theodore F. Green Airport, Providence--	213, 000
South Carolina-----	8, 960, 000
Navy:	
Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort-----	4, 352, 000
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island-----	462, 000
Air Force:	
Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville-----	78, 000
Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach-----	1, 650, 000
Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter-----	1, 339, 000
Army National Guard:	
Belton-----	122, 000
Whitmire-----	99, 000
Chesterfield-----	99, 000
Batesburg-----	99, 000
Clover-----	99, 000
Johnson-----	99, 000
Pacolet Mills-----	99, 000
St. George-----	99, 000
Lake City-----	99, 000
Columbia-----	80, 000
Army Reserve: Greenwood-----	85, 000
South Dakota-----	3, 081, 000
Air Force: Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City-----	2, 931, 000
Army National Guard: Salem-----	150, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Tennessee.....	\$4, 309, 000
<hr/>	
Air Force:	
Memphis General Depot, Memphis.....	1, 464, 000
Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna.....	591, 000
Army National Guard:	
Camden.....	91, 000
Crossville.....	91, 000
Dayton.....	91, 000
Franklin.....	91, 000
Harriman.....	91, 000
Kingsport.....	165, 000
Livingston.....	91, 000
New Bern.....	91, 000
Oak Ridge.....	142, 000
Persons.....	91, 000
South Pittsburg.....	91, 000
Waverly.....	91, 000
Waynesboro.....	91, 000
Nashville.....	493, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Memphis.....	453, 000
<hr/>	
Texas.....	55, 541, 000
<hr/>	
Army:	
Fort Bliss.....	13, 734, 000
Fort Hood.....	4, 258, 000
Navy: Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville.....	1, 041, 000
Air Force:	
Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo.....	979, 000
Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin.....	1, 584, 000
Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso.....	5, 080, 000
Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio.....	13, 805, 000
Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth.....	2, 257, 000
Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene.....	1, 346, 000
James Connally Air Force Base, Waco.....	750, 000
Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio.....	157, 000
Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio.....	897, 000
Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman.....	319, 000
Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio.....	245, 000
Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls.....	2, 051, 000
Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring.....	3, 081, 000
Army National Guard:	
Amarillo.....	231, 000
Belton.....	86, 000
Cuero.....	93, 000
Dallas.....	154, 000
Edna.....	93, 000
El Campo.....	104, 000
Gainesville.....	111, 000
Honey Grove.....	90, 000
Houston No. 1.....	323, 000
Houston No. 2.....	264, 000
Texarkana.....	153, 000
Army Reserve: Sinton.....	134, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval Air Station, Dallas.....	259, 000
Air National Guard: Hensley Field, Grand Prairie.....	1, 862, 000
<hr/>	
Utah.....	1, 981, 000
<hr/>	
Air Force: Hill Air Force Base, Ogden.....	1, 746, 000
Army National Guard: Salt Lake City.....	235, 000
<hr/>	

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Vermont-----	\$1, 335, 000
Air Force: Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski-----	990, 000
Army National Guard:	
Swanton-----	137, 000
Burlington-----	208, 000
Virginia-----	20, 080, 000
Army:	
Fort Lee-----	4, 630, 000
Fort Eustis-----	3, 634, 000
Navy:	
Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren-----	44, 000
Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia Beach-----	1, 184, 000
Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Fentress-----	142, 000
Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk-----	4, 643, 000
Naval Base, Norfolk-----	2, 546, 000
Naval Supply Center, Norfolk-----	128, 000
Marine Corps School, Quantico-----	168, 000
Air Force: Langley Air Force Base, Hampton-----	1, 371, 000
Army National Guard:	
Berryville-----	135, 000
Norfolk-----	441, 000
Pulaski-----	135, 000
Richmond-----	441, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Lynchburg-----	388, 000
Air National Guard: Byrd Field, Richmond-----	50, 000
Washington-----	11, 479, 000
Army: Fort Lewis-----	1, 085, 000
Navy: Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor-----	86, 000
Air Force:	
Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane-----	4, 094, 000
Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake-----	3, 795, 000
McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma-----	935, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve:	
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Centralia-----	81, 000
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Olympia (Tumwater)-----	47, 000
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Yakima-----	48, 000
Air National Guard: Geiger Field, Spokane-----	1, 308, 000
West Virginia-----	1, 674, 000
Army National Guard:	
Beckley-----	200, 000
Clarksburg-----	189, 000
Gassaway-----	189, 000
Keyser-----	157, 000
Logan-----	189, 000
Weston-----	189, 000
Army Reserve:	
Beckley-----	289, 000
Weirton-----	149, 000
Air National Guard: Martinsburg Municipal Airport, Martinsburg-----	123, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Wisconsin	\$17,903,000
Air Force:	
Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville	15,552,000
Truax Field, Madison	795,000
Army Reserve:	
Beloit	157,000
Kewaunee	157,000
Madison	490,000
Air Force Reserve: General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee	173,000
Air National Guard: Camp Williams, Camp Douglas	579,000
Wyoming	433,000
Army National Guard:	
Lovell	142,000
Cody	142,000
Army Reserve: Cheyenne	149,000
Various locations (Zone of Interior)	177,699,000
Army	6,584,000
Air Force	170,396,000
Air National Guard	300,000
Army Reserve	419,000
Classified (Zone of Interior)	484,495,000
Army	123,199,000
Navy	73,796,000
Air Force	287,500,000

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Alaska	3,158,000
Army: Fairbanks	7,000
Air Force:	
Eielson Air Force Base	380,000
Elmendorf Air Force Base	710,000
King Salmon Airport	340,000
Army National Guard:	
Anchorage	192,000
Bethel	480,000
Fairbanks	277,000
Juneau	450,000
Ketchikan	277,000
Sitka	45,000
Bermuda	683,000
Navy: Naval station	683,000
Canal Zone	1,540,000
Air Force: Howard Air Force Base	1,540,000
Cuba	890,000
Navy: Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay	890,000
Eritrea	1,180,000
Navy: Naval Communication Unit No. 3	1,180,000

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Hawaii-----	\$5, 992, 000
Army:	
Kawaihae Harbor-----	240, 000
Schofield Barracks-----	593, 000
Fort Shafter-----	2, 925, 000
Navy:	
Naval Air Station, Ford Island-----	1, 271, 000
Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor-----	159, 000
Air Force: Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu-----	144, 000
Naval and Marine Reserve: Naval and Marine Reserve Training Center, Honolulu-----	515, 000
Army National Guard: Kealahakua-----	145, 000
Mariana Islands-----	8, 982, 000
Navy:	
Naval Air Station, Agana-----	4, 414, 000
Naval Supply Depot, Guam-----	3, 060, 000
Air Force: Andersen Air Force Base-----	1, 508, 000
Midway-----	839, 000
Air Force: Naval Station, Midway Island-----	839, 000
Morocco-----	519, 000
Navy: Naval Radio Facility, Port Lyautey-----	519, 000
North Ireland-----	219, 000
Navy: Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry-----	219, 000
Okinawa-----	165, 000
Navy: Naval Air Facility, Naha-----	165, 000
Puerto Rico-----	4, 735, 000
Navy: Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads-----	3, 824, 000
Air Force: Ramey Air Force Base-----	643, 000
Army National Guard:	
Juncos-----	38, 000
Mayaguez-----	160, 000
Air National Guard: San Juan International Airport, San Juan-----	70, 000
Various locations, overseas-----	122, 517, 000
Army-----	4, 967, 000
Air Force-----	117, 550, 000
Classified locations, overseas-----	79, 427, 000
Army-----	77, 922, 000
Navy-----	1, 505, 000
Locations not specified-----	80, 000, 000
Army-----	25, 000, 000
Navy-----	25, 000, 000
Air Force-----	25, 000, 000
Department of Defense-----	233, 401, 000

APPENDIX

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Submitted herewith are lists of Reserve Forces facilities projects indicating the carryover authorization which would be provided under section 4 of S. 3863, presently under consideration by your committee. Consultation with your committee has previously been effected or is pending on all listed projects, in accordance with the provisions of chapter 133, title 10, United States Code.

The inclosures include a summary for each Reserve component involved, showing the total estimated dollar amount of the carryover authorization based on the obligations as estimated by the respective military departments for the entire fiscal year 1958. The actual amount of the carryover would, of course, be determined by the actual obligation level attained as of June 30, 1958.

Attention is invited to the fact that a reasonable amount of flexibility is provided for the Army Reserve and Army National Guard, as requested by the Department of the Army; while an additional number of projects are listed, the actual net carryover authorization would not exceed the June 30, 1958 unobligated balance of funds heretofore appropriated, as provided in section 4 of the proposed legislation.

Additional copies of the lists can be provided if desired by the committee.

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD S. BRYANT.

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES SUMMARY SHEET

*Fiscal year 1958 and carryover project authorization subject to provisions of
H. R. 12369 and S. 3863*

	Army National Guard	Army Reserve	Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	Air Force Reserve
Total estimated cost (Federal) of listed projects.	\$39,589,456	\$62,553,679	\$24,841,449	\$22,575,356
Less program flexibility.....	7,208,288	11,858,546	9	0
Total available funding, fiscal year 1958.....	32,381,168	50,695,133	¹ 24,841,449	22,575,356
Estimated obligations as of June 30, 1958.....	14,645,456	19,707,679	13,000,000	7,501,356
Estimated carryover authorization.....	17,735,712	30,987,454	¹ 11,841,449	15,074,000

¹ Does not include \$883,162 of unobligated prior year appropriations for which specific project authorization is contained in H. R. 12369 and S. 3863.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

KEY TO TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION

A—Addition	N&ARTC—Naval and Army Reserve training center
ANCI—Ancillary	OMS—Organizational maintenance shop
BN—Battalion	P—Plus
CFMS—Combined field maintenance shop	PLAT—Platoon
CONV—Conversion	REH—Rehabilitation
EXP—Expansion	SH—Shop hangar
MCAS—Marine Corps air station	TKSS—Tank storage shed
MCRTC—Marine Corps Reserve training center	TNG—Training
MVSB—Motor vehicle storage building	U—Unit
NAS—Naval air station	USP&FO OFF—United States property and fiscal officer, office
N&MCRTC—Naval and Marine Corps Reserve training center	UTIL—Utilities
NREF—Naval Reserve electronics facility	WH—Warehouse
NRTC—Naval Reserve training center	

*Fiscal year 1958 and carryover project authorization subject to provisions of
H. R. 12369 and S. 3863*

ARMORY

Location	Type	Obligations as of Apr. 30, 1958	Planned obligations, June 30, 1958	Carryover authoriza- tion
Alabama:				
Birmingham (Med).....	1-U-P & MVSB.....			\$160,000
New Brockton.....	1-U.....			70,000
Slocomb.....	1-U.....		\$67,813	
Springville.....	1-U.....		68,313	
Vincent.....	1-U.....		67,000	
Alaska:				
Anchorage.....	1-U & MVSB.....			450,000
Alakanuk.....	Special.....		20,000	
Dillingham.....	Special.....		20,000	
Hoopers Bay.....	Special.....		20,000	
Kiana.....	Special.....		20,000	
Mount Village.....	Special.....		20,000	
Noatak.....	Special.....		20,000	
Norvik.....	Special.....		20,000	
Selawik.....	Special.....		20,000	
Shungnak.....	Special.....		20,000	
42 Scout armories.....	Special.....			840,000
Kodlak.....	1-U (Plat).....		154,864	
Nome.....	1-U-P & MVSB.....			480,000
Arizona:				
Casa Grande.....	1-U.....			120,000
Douglas.....	1-U & MVSB.....			75,000
Safford.....	1-U.....			120,000
Warren.....	1-U & MVSB.....			120,000
Winslow.....	1-U & MVSB.....			75,000
Arkansas:				
De Witt.....	1-U.....			45,000
Harrison.....	2-U-Exp.....			17,000
North Little Rock.....	5-U-P.....		300,000	
Ozark.....	1-U-P.....	\$43,000		
Warren.....	1-U.....		43,500	
California:				
Anaheim-Fullerton.....	1-U.....			106,000
Petaluma.....	1-U.....			91,000
Riverside.....	2-U-P.....			129,000
Victorville.....	1-U.....		92,000	
Watsonville.....	1-U.....		91,000	
Colorado:				
Colorado Springs.....	1-U-Exp.....		45,000	
Fort Collins.....	2-U-P.....			132,000
Grand Junction.....	2-U-P.....		92,836	
Greeley.....	1-U-P & MVSB.....			132,000
La Junta.....	1-U-P.....			113,000
Connecticut: Naugatuck.....	1-U.....	123,012		
Florida:				
Lake City.....	1-U-P & MVSB.....		97,000	
Live Oak.....	1-U & MVSB.....		97,000	
Miami.....	4-U-Exp.....			60,000
St. Petersburg.....	3-U-P & MVSB.....	140,640		
Tampa.....	6-U-Exp & MVSB.....			36,000

*Fiscal year 1958 and carryover project authorization subject to provisions of
H. R. 12369 and S. 3863—Continued*

ARMORY—Continued

Location	Type	Obligations as of Apr. 30, 1958	Planned obligations, June 30, 1958	Carryover authoriza- tion
Georgia:				
Canton.....	1-U.....	-----	\$90,000	-----
Gainesville.....	1-U.....	-----	-----	\$90,000
Lyons.....	1-U.....	-----	90,000	-----
Macon.....	1-U-P.....	-----	147,000	-----
Do.....	3-U-P.....	-----	-----	221,000
Montezuma.....	1-U.....	-----	67,369	-----
Savannah.....	8-U-P.....	-----	-----	600,000
Hawaii:				
Hilo.....	4-U-P.....	-----	-----	195,000
Do.....	5-U-Exp.....	-----	-----	48,000
Honolulu.....	4-U-P.....	-----	-----	275,000
Lihue.....	1-U-Exp.....	-----	-----	48,000
Idaho:				
Bonnors Ferry.....	1-U-P & MVSB.....	\$65,549	-----	-----
Emmett.....	1-U-P.....	-----	65,000	-----
Gooding.....	1-U & MVSB.....	-----	-----	65,000
Grangeville.....	1-U & MVSB.....	60,143	-----	-----
Idaho Falls.....	2-U-P & MVSB.....	-----	-----	105,000
Lewiston.....	2-U-Exp.....	-----	-----	60,000
Indiana:				
Anderson.....	2-U-P.....	-----	188,000	-----
Bloomington.....	2-U-P.....	-----	232,000	-----
Iowa:				
Glenwood.....	1-U.....	-----	-----	115,000
Le Mars.....	1-U.....	-----	-----	115,000
Ottumwa.....	2-U.....	-----	131,010	-----
Sheldon.....	1-U.....	-----	-----	115,000
Kansas:				
Colby.....	1-U & MVSB.....	-----	-----	80,000
Mankato.....	1-U.....	77,080	-----	-----
Kentucky:				
Ashland.....	1-U-Conv.....	-----	-----	8,000
Barbourville.....	1-U-P-Conv.....	-----	-----	12,000
Bowling Green.....	1-U-P-Conv.....	-----	-----	12,000
Carrollton.....	1-U.....	-----	-----	102,000
Henderson.....	1-U-Conv.....	-----	-----	2,000
Jackson.....	1-U.....	-----	-----	97,000
Livermore.....	1-U-Conv.....	-----	-----	2,000
London.....	1-U-Conv.....	-----	-----	9,000
Olive Hill.....	1-U.....	-----	102,000	-----
Paducah.....	1-U-Conv.....	-----	-----	18,000
Ravenna.....	1-U-Conv.....	-----	-----	1,000
Richmond.....	2-U-P-Conv.....	-----	-----	3,000
Russellville.....	1-U-Conv.....	-----	-----	11,000
Somerset.....	1-U-Conv.....	-----	-----	12,000
St. Matthews.....	2-U-P-Conv.....	-----	-----	19,000
Tompkinsville.....	1-U.....	-----	-----	132,000
Williamsburg.....	1-U-Conv.....	-----	-----	3,000
Maine:				
Bangor.....	2-U-Exp & MVSB.....	-----	-----	150,000
Bath.....	1-U-Exp & MVSB.....	-----	-----	75,000
Maryland: Cumberland.....	1-U-P.....	-----	185,000	-----
Massachusetts:				
Bridgewater.....	1-U.....	-----	-----	200,000
Cambridge.....	3-U-P.....	-----	259,671	-----
Framingham.....	2-U-P.....	-----	216,595	-----
Leominster.....	1-U.....	-----	-----	200,000
Northbridge.....	1-U-P.....	-----	173,408	-----
Southbridge.....	1-U.....	-----	-----	200,000
Michigan:				
Albion.....	1-U & MVSB.....	-----	186,479	-----
Big Rapids.....	MVSB.....	6,719	-----	-----
Sault St. Marie.....	1-U & MVSB.....	-----	-----	225,000
Minnesota:				
East St. Paul.....	1-U & MVSB.....	-----	110,000	-----
Redwood Falls.....	1-U-Reh.....	-----	-----	5,000
St. Cloud.....	2-U-P & MVSB.....	-----	-----	255,000
West St. Paul.....	1-U & MVSB.....	-----	110,000	-----
White Bear Lake.....	1-U-Reh.....	-----	-----	5,000
Mississippi:				
Bay St. Louis.....	1-U.....	-----	-----	54,000
Clarksdale.....	1-U.....	49,770	-----	-----
Greenville.....	2-U-P-Exp.....	-----	-----	86,000
Hattiesburg.....	2-U-P.....	78,038	-----	-----
Hazelhurst.....	1-U.....	-----	-----	54,000
Iuka.....	1-U.....	-----	-----	54,000

*Fiscal year 1958 and carryover project authorization subject to provisions of
H. R. 12369 and S. 3863—Continued*

ARMORY—Continued

Location	Type	Obligations as of Apr. 30, 1958	Planned obligations, June 30, 1958	Carryover authoriza- tion
Mississippi—Continued				
Laurel	2-U-P	\$86,158		
Lumberton	1-U	50,974		
Pascagoula	2-U			\$76,000
Prentiss	1-U	52,033		
Quitman	1-U			54,000
Missouri:				
Farmington	1-U			115,000
Fulton	1-U			115,000
Lexington	1-U			115,000
Moherly	1-U		\$115,000	
Montana:				
Chinook	1-U			64,000
Dillon	1-U			64,000
Hamilton	1-U			63,000
Whitefish	1-U			63,000
Nebraska: Omaha	5-U-P			450,000
Nevada:				
Ely	1-U			101,000
Yerington	1-U		103,735	
New Hampshire:				
Keene	2-U-P		213,000	
Nashua	2-U-P	171,121		
New Jersey:				
Cape May Court House	2-U-P			250,000
Delaware Township	1-U-P-Exp			74,000
Long Branch	2-U-P		212,000	
Woodbridge	3-U			338,000
New Mexico:				
Artesia	1-U			94,000
Clovis	1-U			94,000
Farmington	1-U		56,867	
Hobbs	1-U		56,995	
Las Cruces	2-U			130,000
Portales	1-U			94,000
Roswell	3-U-P			200,000
New York:				
Amsterdam	Conv.			55,000
Cornlng	Conv.			60,000
Dunkirk	Conv.		71,000	
Freeport	3-U-P			400,000
Geneva	Conv.		54,000	
Glens Falls	Conv.		45,000	
Gloversville	Conv.			39,000
Hornell	Conv.		35,000	
Hudson	Conv.		52,000	
Huntington	2-U & MVS.B.	342,529		
Jamestown	Conv.		84,000	
Malone	Conv.		56,000	
Medina	Conv.		43,000	
Ogdensburg	Conv.		45,000	
Olean	Conv.			46,000
Oneonta	Conv.		45,000	
Orangeburg (Nyack)	2-U-P			300,000
Oswego	Conv.			52,000
Schenectady	Conv.			96,000
Ticonderoga	Conv.		45,000	
Troy	Conv.			47,000
Whitehall	Conv.			40,000
North Carolina:				
Benson	1-U			105,000
Durham	3-U-P	162,842		
Elizabeth City	1-U			105,000
Mooreville	1-U			105,000
Mount Olive	1-U			105,000
Roxboro	1-U			105,000
Siler City	1-U			105,000
Statesville	1-U		83,000	
Windsor	1-U			105,000
North Dakota:				
Bismarek	2-U-P			212,000
Fargo	1-U-P			142,000
Jamestown	1-U-P			153,000
Mandan	1-U-P-Reh.			126,000
Mott	1-U			153,000

*Fiscal year 1958 and carryover project authorization subject to provisions of
H. R. 12369 and S. 3863—Continued*

ARMORY—Continued

Location	Type	Obligations as of Apr. 30, 1958	Planned obligations, June 30, 1958	Carryover authoriza- tion
Ohio:				
Columbus (north end).....	3-U-P.....		\$226,908	
Logan.....	1-U & MVS.....			\$166,000
Massillon.....	1-U & MVS.....		150,000	
Sandusky.....	1-U-P & MVS.....			160,000
Oregon:				
Oswego.....	1-U.....			125,000
Salem.....	2-U.....			160,000
Pennsylvania:				
Allentown.....	2-U-P-Reh.....		150,000	
Hanover.....	1-U & MVS.....	\$153,400		
Kutztown.....	1-U.....			171,000
Lebanon.....	2-U.....			206,000
Sharon.....	1-U.....		150,000	
Tamaqua.....	2-U.....		206,000	
West Pittston.....	1-U.....	157,807		
Puerto Rico:				
Aibonito.....	1-U.....			75,000
Bayamon.....	3-U.....			150,000
Caguas.....	2-U.....	59,556		
Huacabo.....	2-U.....			71,000
Ponce.....	2-U-P.....			150,000
Sabana Grande.....	1-U.....			75,000
San German.....	2-U.....			150,00
Yauco.....	1-U.....	36,774		
South Carolina:				
Allendale.....	1-U.....			99,000
Bamberg.....	1-U.....		99,000	
Conway.....	1-U.....			99,000
Inman.....	1-U.....			99,000
Jonesville.....	1-U.....			99,000
Manning.....	1-U.....		99,000	
McCormick.....	1-U.....			99,000
Ridgeland.....	1-U.....	90,360		
Saluda.....	1-U.....			99,000
Summerville.....	1-U.....	90,555		
South Dakota:				
Lead.....	1-U.....		137,000	
Madison.....	2-U-P & MVS.....			205,000
Miller.....	1-U & MVS.....		148,000	
Mitchell.....	2-U-P.....		172,000	
Sioux Falls.....	1-U-P.....		164,632	
Springfield.....	1-U & MVS.....			188,000
Tennessee:				
Bristol.....	2-U.....		127,706	
Covington.....	1-U.....		81,000	
Knoxville.....	5-U-P.....		295,458	
Milli.....	1-U.....			91,000
Nashville.....	5-U-P.....			365,000
Smithville.....	1-U.....			91,000
Texas:				
Beaumont.....	1-U.....			117,000
Brownfield.....	1-U.....			113,000
Cameron.....	1-U.....			120,000
Clifton.....	1-U.....			113,000
Coleman.....	1-U.....			113,000
Corpus Christi.....	2-U-P.....		86,000	
Dallas, No. 4 (White Rock).....	2-U-P.....			168,000
Decatur.....	1-U.....			84,000
Donna.....	1-U.....			99,000
Gonzales.....	1-U.....			153,000
Houston, No. 3.....	2-U.....		82,000	
Longview.....	1-U-P.....		74,000	
Mineral Wells.....	1-U-P.....	92,556		
New Braunfels.....	2-U-P.....			150,000
Orange.....	1-U-P.....			111,000
Raymondville.....	1-U.....	76,263		
Terrell.....	1-U-P.....			133,000
Victoria.....	1-U.....			113,000
Utah: Ogden.....	3-U-P & MVS.....		185,384	
Vermont:				
Bradford.....	1-U.....		169,000	
Enosburg Falls.....	1-U.....			169,000
Williston.....	1-U.....	122,040		
Windsor.....	1-U.....		169,000	

*Fiscal year 1958 and carryover project authorization subject to provisions of)
H. R. 12369 and S. 3863—Continued*

ARMORY—Continued

Location	Type	Obligations as of Apr. 30, 1958	Planned obligations, June 30, 1958	Carryover authoriza- tion
Virginia:				
Bassett.....	1-U.....			\$154,000
Big Stone Gap.....	1-U.....			154,000
Christiansburg.....	1-U-P.....			165,000
Gate City.....	1-U-P.....		\$135,600	
Manassas.....	2-U-P.....		170,000	
Staunton.....	1-U-Exp.....			45,000
Washington:				
Camas.....	1-U-Exp.....		60,000	
Okanogan.....	1-U.....	\$121,418		
Pasco.....	MVSB.....		40,000	
Poulsbo.....	1-U-Exp.....		60,000	
Shelton.....	MVSB.....		18,000	
Snohomish.....	MVSB.....		18,000	
Wenatchee.....	MVSB.....		5,000	
Yakima.....	MVSB.....		26,000	
West Virginia:				
Dunbar.....	1-U-P.....			200,000
Moundsville.....	1-U-P.....		184,480	
Parkersburg.....	2-U-P & MVSB.....			250,000
Princeton.....	Conv.....			60,000
Richwood.....	1-U & MVSB.....		174,745	
Ronceverte.....	Conv.....			54,000
Salem.....	1-U-P.....			180,000
Williamson.....	1-U & MVSB.....	149,019		
Wisconsin:				
La Crosse.....	1-U.....			160,000
Milwaukee.....	2-U-P.....			235,000
Mosinee.....	1-U.....		123,660	
Plymouth.....	1-U.....	132,365		
Wausau.....	1-U-P.....			160,000
Wyoming:				
Laramie.....	2-U-P & MVSB.....	187,745		
New Castle.....	1-U.....			135,000
Total.....		2,979,466	9,152,028	19,614,000

NONARMORY—Continued

Alabama: Dannelly Field (Montgomery).....	SH.....		\$95,420	
Alaska: Anchorage.....	USP&FO Off.....			\$71,000
California:				
Los Angeles (Van Nuys).....	SH.....			97,000
Stockton.....	SHA.....		49,000	
Colorado: Buckley Field.....	SH.....		64,000	
Florida: Camp Blanding.....	CFMS.....			167,000
Georgia: Fort Stewart.....	CFMS.....			221,000
Do.....	TNG.....			580,000
Hawaii: Fort Ruger (Oahu).....	CFMS.....			63,000
Idaho: Gowen Field.....	SH.....	\$61,169		
Indiana: Indianapolis (Stout Field).....	OMS.....			72,000
Kentucky:				
Capitol City Airport (Frankfort).....	SH.....			90,000
Frankfort.....	USP&FO Off.....		43,000	
Frankfort (Capitol City).....	WH.....			270,000
Maine: Camp Keyes (Augusta).....	CFMS.....	216,910		
Massachusetts:				
Boston (Dorchester).....	OMS.....		48,000	
Fitchburg.....	SH.....			183,000
Fort Devens (Ayer).....	CFMS.....			400,000
Natick.....	WHIA.....		197,296	
New Bedford.....	OMS.....			39,000
Worcester.....	OMS.....		49,000	
Michigan:				
Camp Grayling.....	OMS.....			57,000
Do.....	TNG (1 Bn).....			296,000
Lansing.....	SH.....			170,000
Mississippi: Camp Shelby.....	TNG (2 Bn).....			580,000
Montana: Helena (municipal airport).....	SH.....			90,000
Nebraska: Lincoln.....	WH&USP&FO Off.....		175,227	
Nevada:				
Carson City.....	CFMS.....		168,910	
Do.....	USP&FO Off.....			66,000
New Hampshire: Concord.....	SH.....		100,503	

*Fiscal year 1958 and carryover project authorization subject to provisions of
H. R. 12369 and S. 3863—Continued*

NONARMORY—Continued

Location	Type	Obligations as of Apr. 30, 1958	Planned obligations, June 30, 1958	Carryover authoriza- tion
New Jersey:				
Camp Drum, N. Y., for New Jersey..	TKSS (2).....	-----	\$120,000	-----
Do.....	CFMS.....	-----	-----	\$308,000
Jersey City.....	OMS.....	-----	-----	49,000
Morristown.....	SH.....	-----	-----	90,000
Orange.....	OMS.....	-----	-----	33,000
Trenton.....	USP&FO Off.....	-----	-----	40,000
West Orange.....	CFMS (Util).....	-----	75,000	-----
Do.....	CFMS (Ancl).....	-----	236,000	-----
New Mexico: Santa Fe.....	CFMS.....	-----	-----	249,000
North Carolina: Camp Butler.....	CFMS.....	-----	-----	427,000
North Dakota:				
Bismarck.....	USP&FO Off.....	-----	-----	43,000
Do.....	SH.....	-----	-----	57,000
Oklahoma:				
Norman.....	WH.....	-----	38,704	-----
Oklahoma City.....	SH.....	-----	-----	86,000
Puerto Rico: San Juan.....	CFMS.....	-----	148,000	-----
Rhode Island: Smithfield.....	CFMS.....	-----	265,000	-----
South Carolina: Columbia.....	USP&FO Off.....	-----	-----	52,000
South Dakota: Rapid City.....	SH.....	\$46,328	-----	-----
Vermont: Burlington (Camp Johnson).....	SH.....	42,217	-----	-----
Virginia: Byrd Field (Richmond).....	SH.....	-----	75,149	-----
West Virginia:				
Buckhannon.....	USP&FO Off.....	-----	-----	48,000
Do.....	WH.....	-----	-----	158,000
Clarksburg.....	OMS.....	-----	-----	46,000
Parkersburg.....	SH.....	-----	65,991	-----
Wisconsin:				
Eau Claire.....	OMS.....	-----	-----	40,000
Hayward.....	OMS.....	-----	-----	52,000
Milwaukee (West Bend).....	SH.....	-----	133,138	-----
Wausau.....	OMS.....	-----	-----	40,000
Total.....	-----	366,624	2,147,338	5,330,000

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

[Report No. 1982]

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in *italic*]

I

1 appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following
2 projects:

3 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

4 TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

5 (Ordnance Corps)

6 Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing,
7 and utilities, \$2,697,000.

8 Detroit Arsenal, Michigan: Administrative facilities,
9 \$5,666,000.

10 Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Administrative facilities,
11 troop housing, and utilities, \$8,529,000.

12 Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois: Operational and training
13 facilities, \$570,000.

14 White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico: Operational
15 and training facilities, research, development and test facili-
16 ties, medical facilities, troop housing, and community
17 facilities, \$7,931,000.

18 (Quartermaster Corps)

19 Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational and training facilities,
20 and troop housing, \$4,630,000.

21 (Chemical Corps)

22 Army Chemical Center, Maryland: Troop housing, and
23 utilities, \$2,051,000.

24 Fort Detrick, Maryland: Troop housing, \$795,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$9,098,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Army Map Service, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, \$1,913,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,634,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Troop housing, \$862,000.

FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, \$171,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Troop housing and utilities, \$3,749,000.

1 (Second Army Area)

2 Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: Hospital facilities,
3 family housing and real estate, \$2,274,000.

4 Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational and training facili-
5 ties ,and utilities, \$516,000.

6 Fort Meade, Maryland: Operational and training facili-
7 ties, \$498,000.

8 Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Supply facilities, \$43,000.

9 (Third Army Area)

10 Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational and training facili-
11 ties, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and family hous-
12 ing, \$3,454,000.

13 Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and training
14 facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$762,000.

15 Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational and training fa-
16 cilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and admin-
17 istrative facilities, \$847,000.

18 Fort McClellan, Alabama: Operational and training
19 facilities, and hospital facilities, \$3,505,000.

20 Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facili-
21 ties, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities,
22 \$2,406,000.

1 (Fourth Army Area)

2 Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities,
3 maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$13,734,-
4 000.

5 Fort Hood, Texas: Operational and training facilities,
6 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
7 ties, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,258,000.

8 Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities,
9 maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities,
10 \$3,227,000.

11 (Fifth Army Area)

12 Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Troop housing, and
13 family housing, \$783,000.

14 Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Operational and training
15 facilities, and troop housing, \$1,076,000.

16 Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational and training facilities,
17 and utilities, \$1,084,000.

18 (Sixth Army Area)

19 Baywood Park, California: Real estate, \$144,000.

20 Camp Desert Rock, Nevada: Maintenance facilities,
21 troop housing, and utilities, \$2,892,000.

22 Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational and training
23 facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,085,000.

1 Fort Ord, California: Operational and training facilities,
 2 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-
 3 munity facilities, and utilities, \$4,733,000.

4 Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Operational and training
 5 facilities, \$173,000.

6 (Military Academy)

7 United States Military Academy, West Point, New
 8 York: Troop housing, medical facilities, and community
 9 facilities, \$5,844,000.

10 (Armed Forces Special Weapons)

11 Various locations: Maintenance facilities, community
 12 facilities, and utilities, \$273,000.

13 (Tactical Installations Support Facilities)

14 Various locations: Maintenance facilities, \$6,311,000.

15 OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

16 (Alaskan Area)

17 Fairbanks Permafrost Research Area: Real estate,
 18 \$7,000.

19 (Pacific Command Area)

20 Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: Operational and training
 21 facilities, \$240,000.

22 Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Troop housing, \$593,000.

23 Fort Shafter, Hawaii: Supply facilities, maintenance
 24 facilities, family housing, and community facilities, \$2,
 25 925,000.

1 Korea: Operational and training facilities, supply facili-
2 ties, and utilities, \$904,000.

3 (United States Army, Europe)

4 France: Operational and training facilities, maintenance
5 facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply
6 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,063,000.

7 SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or
8 develop classified military installations and facilities by ac-
9 quiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing
10 permanent or temporary public works, including land acqui-
11 sition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equip-
12 ment, in the total amount of \$201,121,000.

13 SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish
14 or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding
15 with construction made necessary by changes in Army mis-
16 sions, new weapons development, new and unforeseen re-
17 search and development requirements, or improved produc-
18 tion schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that
19 deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military
20 construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with
21 interests of national security, and in connection therewith
22 to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install perma-
23 nent or temporary public works, including land acquisition,
24 site preparataion, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in
25 the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Sec-

1 retary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Com-
2 mittees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of
3 Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision
4 to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work
5 undertaken under this section, including those real estate
6 actions pertaining thereto.

7 SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of sec-
8 tion 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119,
9 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized
10 to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing
11 for occupancy as public quarters of the following locations
12 by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the pro-
13 visions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assist-
14 ance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other com-
15 modity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

16 Various locations, France, 298 units.

17 Vicenza, Italy, 371 units.

18 Army Security Agency, location 13, 91 units.

19 Gateway Communications Station, 174 units.

20 (b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of
21 the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as
22 amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to con-
23 struct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at
24 the following locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

- 1
- 2 Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, 316 units.
- 3 Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York, 120 units.
- 4 White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, 200 units.
- 5 Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, 130 units.
- 6 Fort Lee, Virginia, 435 units.
- 7 Natick R&E, Massachusetts, 35 units.
- 8 Fort Belvoir, Virginia, 618 units.
- 9 Two Rock Ranch Station, California, 25 units.
- 10 Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 50 units.
- 11 Beaumont Army Hospital, Texas, 125 units.
- 12 Fort Totten, New York, 130 units.
- 13 Fort Bragg, North Carolina, 367 units.
- 14 Fort Campbell, Kentucky, 837 units.
- 15 Granite City Engineers Depot, Illinois, 65 units.
- 16 Fort Rucker, Alabama, 400 units.
- 17 Fort Stewart, Georgia, 73 units.
- 18 Fort Bliss, Texas, 410 units.
- 19 Fort Hood, Texas, 500 units.
- 20 Fort Sill, Oklahoma, 349 units.
- 21 Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 700 units.
- 22 Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, 200.
- 23 Fort Sheridan, Illinois, 50 units.
- 24 Forts Baker and Barry, California, 98 units.

- 1 Oakland Army Terminal, California, 88 units.
- 2 Fort Lewis, Washington, 856 units.
- 3 Branch United States Disciplinary Barracks, California,
- 4 160 units.
- 5 United States Military Academy, New York, 156 units.
- 6 Bossier Base, Louisiana, 200 units.
- 7 Fort Eustis, Virginia, 223 units.
- 8 Medina Base, Texas, 125 units.
- 9 Sandia Base, New Mexico, 213 units.
- 10 Army Air Defense Command Stations, 466 units.

11 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

- 12 Canal Zone, 330 units.
- 13 Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, 385 units.
- 14 Fort Shafter, Hawaii, 481 units: *Provided, however,*
- 15 That no family housing units shall be constructed on Fort
- 16 DeRussy.

17 (c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404
 18 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as
 19 amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to acquire
 20 family housing at the following location:

- 21 Aberdeen Proving Ground, Aberdeen, Maryland, 796
- 22 units.

23 SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress,
 24 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
 25 UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

1 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICE FACILI-
 2 TIES (Ordnance Corps)”, with respect to Pueblo Ordnance
 3 Depot, Colorado, strike out “\$563,000” and insert in place
 4 thereof “\$600,000”.

5 (b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as
 6 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
 7 tion 502 the amounts “\$44,407,000” and “\$134,075,000”
 8 and inserting in place thereof “\$44,444,000” and “\$134,-
 9 112,000”, respectively.

10 SEC. 106. Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
 11 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
 12 502 the amounts “\$131,906,000” and “\$238,870,000” and
 13 inserting in place thereof “\$149,123,000” and “\$256,087,-
 14 000”, respectively.

15 SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-
 16 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTI-
 17 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

18 (1) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-
 19 CILITIES (Ordnance Corps)”, with respect to Redstone
 20 Arsenal, Alabama, strike out “\$2,865,000” and insert in
 21 place thereof “\$4,180,000”.

22 (2) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-
 23 CILITIES (Signal Corps)” with respect to Fort Monmouth,
 24 New Jersey, strike out “\$615,000” and insert in place
 25 thereof “\$731,000”; and with respect to Vint Hill Farms

1 Station, Virginia, strike out "\$695,000" and insert in place
2 thereof "\$1,022,000".

3 (3) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-
4 CILITIES (Corps of Engineers)", with respect to Granite
5 City Engineer Depot, Illinois, strike out "\$1,822,000" and
6 insert in place thereof "\$2,815,000".

7 (4) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-
8 CILITIES (Medical Corps)", with respect to Walter Reed
9 Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, strike out "\$4,-
10 472,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,714,000".

11 (5) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
12 (Second Army Area)", with respect to Fort George G.
13 Meade, Maryland, strike out "\$923,000" and insert in place
14 thereof \$1,264,000".

15 (6) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
16 (Fourth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas,
17 strike out "\$4,645,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,-
18 965,000"; and with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike
19 out "\$3,053,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,454,000".

20 (7) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
21 (Sixth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Ord, California,
22 strike out "\$1,407,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,-
23 742,000".

24 (8) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
25 (Military Academy)", with respect to the United States

1 Military Academy, New York, strike out “\$756,000” and
2 insert in place thereof “\$1,171,000”.

3 (b) Public Law 461, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
4 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
5 502 the amounts “\$237,320,000” and “\$546,387,000” and
6 inserting in place thereof “\$244,125,000” and “\$553,192,-
7 000”, respectively.

8 SEC. 108.—(a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
9 as amended, is amended under the heading “INSIDE THE
10 UNITED STATES” in section 401, as follows:

11 (1) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
12 FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)”, with respect to White
13 Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico, strike out “\$693,000”
14 and insert in place thereof “\$735,000”.

15 (2) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
16 FACILITIES (Chemical Corps)”, with respect to Camp
17 Detrick, Maryland, strike out “\$913,000” and insert in place
18 thereof “\$1,074,000”; and with respect to Dugway Proving
19 Ground, Utah, strike out “\$867,000” and insert in place
20 thereof “\$1,044,000”.

21 (3) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
22 FACILITIES (Signal Corps)”, with respect to Fort Hua-
23 chuea, Arizona, strike out “\$6,856,000” and insert in place
24 thereof “\$7,576,000”.

25 (4) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES

1 FACILITIES ~~(Corps of Engineers)~~”, with respect to Fort
 2 Belvoir, Virginia, strike out “\$492,000” and insert in place
 3 thereof “\$940,000”.

4 ~~(5)~~ Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
 5 FACILITIES ~~(Transportation Corps)~~”, with respect to Fort
 6 Eustis, Virginia, strike out “\$1,231,000” and insert in place
 7 thereof “\$1,436,000”.

8 ~~(6)~~ Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
 9 ~~(First Army Area)~~”, with respect to Fort Dix, New Jersey,
 10 strike out “\$54,000” and insert in place thereof “\$68,000”.

11 ~~(7)~~ Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
 12 ~~(Second Army Area)~~”, with respect to Fort George G.
 13 Meade, Maryland, strike out “\$5,885,000” and insert in
 14 place thereof “\$7,695,000”.

15 ~~(8)~~ Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
 16 ~~(Third Army Area)~~”, with respect to Fort Benning,
 17 Georgia, strike out “\$422,000” and insert in place thereof
 18 “\$616,000”; and with respect to Fort McClellan, Alabama,
 19 strike out “\$397,000” and insert in place thereof
 20 “\$527,000”.

21 ~~(9)~~ Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
 22 ~~(Fourth Army Area)~~”, with respect to Fort Hood, Texas,
 23 strike out “\$2,457,000” and insert in place thereof
 24 “\$2,846,000”.

25 ~~(10)~~ Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILI-

1 THE ~~(Fifth Army Area)~~”, with respect to Fort Riley,
 2 Kansas, strike out “\$1,519,000” and insert in place thereof
 3 “\$1,892,000”.

4 (11) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILI-
 5 TIES ~~(Sixth Army Area)~~”, with respect to Fort Lewis,
 6 Washington, strike out “\$3,022,000” and insert in place
 7 thereof “\$3,596,000”; and with respect to Fort Ord, Cali-
 8 fornia, strike out “\$223,000” and insert in place thereof
 9 “\$319,000”.

10 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 11 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE THE
 12 UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

13 Under the subheading “~~(Alaskan Area)~~”, with re-
 14 spect to Wildwood Station ~~(Kenai)~~, strike out “\$352,000”
 15 and insert in place thereof “\$516,000”.

16 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 17 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
 18 tion 402 the amounts “\$95,010,000”, “\$35,763,000”, and
 19 “\$334,104,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$100,
 20 343,000”, “\$35,927,000”, and “\$339,601,000”, respec-
 21 tively.

22 SEC. 109. (a) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Con-
 23 gress, is amended under the heading “INSIDE THE UNITED
 24 STATES” in section 101 as follows:

25 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACIL-

1 ITIES (Corps of Engineers)" with respect to Cold Regions
 2 Laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire, strike out "\$2,496,-
 3 000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,787,000".

4 (b) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is
 5 amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the
 6 amounts "\$115,624,000" and "\$293,103,000" and insert-
 7 ing in place thereof "\$116,915,000" and "\$294,394,000".

8 SEC. 110. The Secretary of the Army is authorized and
 9 directed to enter into a contract or contracts for the sale of
 10 the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Texas, and convey a clear
 11 title by quitclaim deed all right, title, and interest of the
 12 United States in and to said depots, to any legal person or
 13 group, except Government agencies or departments, upon
 14 such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be
 15 in the public interest. The Secretary of the Army is directed
 16 to act as follows:

17 (1) The depot shall be moved to, and integrated
 18 with, the ammunition outloading terminal previously
 19 authorized for construction at Point Aux Pins, Ala-
 20 bama, and, notwithstanding any other provisions of this
 21 or any other Act, the authority contained in the Act of
 22 July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 536), for the acquisition of
 23 land and initiation of construction for the Point-Aux-
 24 Pins facility shall continue in effect until specifically
 25 superseded, modified, or repealed.

(2) The sale of the San Jacinto Depot property shall be offered by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on behalf of and under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army within eighteen months from the date of this Act. No part of the land herein shall be sold, transferred, or occupied, by virtue of this transaction, by any Government agency or department.

(3) A contract or contracts for the sale of the San Jacinto Depot shall be consummated as expeditiously as possible thereafter and on such terms as are determined by the Secretary of the Army to be in the best interest of the United States: *Provided*, That if the property is to be conveyed under any terms by which the purchase price is not paid in full simultaneously with the signing of the contract, title shall remain in the United States until full payment is made.

(4) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, and the monetary limitation imposed by section 502 hereof shall not be inclusive of any funds required for or in connection with the San Jacinto Depot relocation.

Notwithstanding any provision of this section to the contrary the United States may retain possession of the

1 San Jacinto Depot or any part thereof until such time as
2 facilities are substantially completed and available for use
3 at Point Aux Pins, Alabama.

4 TITLE II

5 SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish
6 or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring,
7 constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing perma-
8 nent or temporary public works, including site preparation,
9 appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following
10 projects:

11 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

12 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

13 Naval Facility, Cape May, New Jersey: Operational
14 and training facilities, \$141,000.

15 Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Drydock,
16 \$10,000,000.

17 Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Operational
18 and training facilities, \$6,000,000: *Provided, however, That*
19 *no more than \$500,000 of this sum shall be utilized for*
20 *protective works until the Secretary of the Navy determines*
21 *in his judgment that sufficient action has been taken or*
22 *arrangements made to arrest further subsidence of the ship-*
23 *yard.*

24 Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut:
25 Operational and training facilities, \$2,247,000.

1 Navy Shipyard, San Francisco, California: Operational
2 and training facilities, \$766,000.

3 FLEET BASE FACILITIES

4 Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing,
5 and community facilities, \$1,709,000.

6 Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational and train-
7 ing facilities, \$2,546,000.

8 AVIATION FACILITIES

9 (Naval Air Training Stations)

10 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Troop
11 housing, \$1,041,000.

12 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi:
13 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
14 supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community
15 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements
16 \$14,940,000.

17 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida:
18 Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground im-
19 provements, and real estate, \$4,679,00.

20 (Fleet Support Air Stations)

21 Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational and
22 training facilities, \$114,000.

23 Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Maintenance
24 facilities, \$1,252,000.

1 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Cali-
2 fornia: Operational and training facilities, \$47,000.

3 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, \$80,000.

5 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Fentress, Virginia:
6 Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

7 Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina:
8 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
9 medical facilities, troop housing, administrative facilities, and
10 utilities and ground improvements, \$11,215,000.

11 Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational
12 and training facilities, \$74,000.

13 Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and
14 training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, admin-
15 istrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground
16 improvement, \$15,823,000.

17 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, community fa-
19 cilities, utilities, and real estate, \$9,892,000.

20 Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California:
21 Operational facilities, and real estate, \$7,000,000.

22 Naval Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field, Florida:
23 Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)-

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities and real estate, \$4,352,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,067,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, \$1,003,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Operational and training facilities, \$2,158,000.

(Special Purpose Air Stations)-

Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, utilities, and operational and training facilities at the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland, \$17,666,000.

Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing (including operational and training facilities and troop housing on San Nicolas Island; and maintenance

1 nance facilities, research, development and test facilities,
 2 supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground
 3 improvements at Camp Cooke), \$13,841,000.

4 SUPPLY FACILITIES

5 Naval Supply Depot, Newport, Rhode Island: Utilities,
 6 \$2,210,000.

7 Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Administrative
 8 facilities, \$128,000.

9 Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California: Administra-
 10 tive facilities, \$146,000.

11 MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

12 Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California:
 13 Operational and training facilities, \$280,000.

14 Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Caro-
 15 lina: Utilities, \$462,000.

16 Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Opera-
 17 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop
 18 housing and utilities, \$5,138,000.

19 Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Operational
 20 and training facilities, \$168,000.

21 Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California:
 22 Utilities, \$206,000.

23 Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California:
 24 Maintenance facilities, \$241,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California: Supply facilities, \$129,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord, California: Maintenance facilities, \$2,517,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, California: Research, development, and test facilities, \$510,000.

Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Virginia: Research, development, and test facilities, \$44,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Hingham, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, \$694,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, \$601,000.

SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Troop housing, \$14,200,000.

Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$1,184,000.

Naval Receiving Station, District of Columbia: Operational facilities, \$650,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Operational and training facilities, \$1,368,000.

1 Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island: Opera-
2 tional and training facilities, \$273,000.

3 Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, \$4,643,000.

5 Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Opera-
6 tional and training facilities, \$4,199,000.

7 MEDICAL FACILITIES

8 National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland:
9 Hospital and medical facilities, \$8,503,000.

10 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

11 Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Oper-
12 ational and training facilities, and utilities and ground im-
13 provements, \$38,654,000.

14 OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

15 Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Re-
16 search, development, and test facilities, \$192,000.

17 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

18 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

19 Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory
20 of Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, \$159,000.

21 AVIATION FACILITIES

22 Naval Air Station, Agana, Mariana Islands: Opera-
23 tional and training facilities, and real estate, \$4,414,000.

24 Naval Station, Bermuda, British West Indies: Opera-
25 tional and training facilities, \$683,000.

1 Naval Air Station, Ford Island, Territory of Hawaii:
2 Operational and training facilities, \$1,271,000.

3 Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Supply facilities,
4 \$165,000.

5 Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Opera-
6 tional and training facilities, \$3,824,000.

7 SUPPLY FACILITIES

8 Naval Supply Depot, Guam, Mariana Islands: Supply
9 facilities, \$3,060,000.

10 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

11 Naval Communication Unit Number Three, Asmara,
12 Eritrea: Operational and training facilities, \$1,180,000.

13 Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland:
14 Operational and training facilities, \$219,000.

15 Naval Radio Facility, Port Lyautey, Morocco: Opera-
16 tional and training facilities, \$519,000.

17 ~~YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES~~

18 Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities,
19 \$890,000.

20 SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish
21 or develop classified naval installations and facilities by
22 acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or in-
23 stalling permanent or temporary public works, including
24 land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and
25 equipment in the total amount of \$75,301,000.

1 SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or
2 develop naval installations and facilities by proceeding with
3 construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions,
4 new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research
5 and development requirements, or improved production
6 schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that de-
7 ferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military
8 construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with
9 interests of national security, and in connection therewith to
10 acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent
11 or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
12 preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the
13 total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary
14 of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on
15 Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives
16 immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of
17 the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under
18 this section, including those real estate actions pertaining
19 thereto.

20 SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of
21 section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119,
22 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized
23 to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing
24 for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities
25 at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies

1 acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade
 2 Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454)
 3 or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity
 4 Credit Corporation:

5 Naval Magazine, Cartagena, Spain, 46 units, and com-
 6 munity facilities.

7 Naval Magazine, El Ferrol, Spain, 45 units, and com-
 8 munity facilities.

9 Naval Air Station, Port Lyautey, Morocco, 330 units.

10 Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Italy, 122 units, and
 11 community facilities.

12 (b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the
 13 Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended,
 14 the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family
 15 housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following
 16 locations:

17 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

18 Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, 277 units.

19 Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina,
 20 800 units.

21 Naval Facility, Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, 27 units.

22 Naval Facility, Centerville, California, 24 units.

23 Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Caro-
 24 lina, 849 units.

25 Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oregon, 24 units.

- 1 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, 425 units.
- 2 Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 800 units.
- 3 Naval Facility, Nantucket, Massachusetts, 19 units.
- 4 Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500
- 5 units.
- 6 Naval Facility, Pacific Beach, Washington, 30 units
- 7 Naval Facility, Point Sur, California, 24 units.
- 8 Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, 550
- 9 units.
- 10 Naval Ordnance Missile Test Facility, White Sands
- 11 Proving Grounds, New Mexico, 51 units.
- 12 Naval Base, San Diego, California, 1,000 units, to be
- 13 constructed on land, including the following tracts which
- 14 are hereby authorized and directed to be transferred to the
- 15 Department of the Navy by the Administrator of General
- 16 Services without reimbursement: GSA H-Cal 446D; GSA
- 17 H-Cal 546B; and GSA H-Cal 587.

18 OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES

- 19 Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of
- 20 Hawaii, 1,140 units.
- 21 Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, Headquarters, Camp H. M.
- 22 Smith, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 168 units.
- 23 Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands, 220 units.
- 24 Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Terri-
- 25 tory of Hawaii, 650 units.

1 Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii,
2 80 units.

3 Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii,
4 650 units.

5 (c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404
6 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as
7 amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to acquire
8 family housing at the following locations:

9 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, 96
10 units.

11 Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Maryland, 385
12 units.

13 Naval Station, Green Cove Springs, Florida, 392 units.

14 SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Con-
15 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTI-
16 NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

17 Under the subheading "MEDICAL FACILITIES", with re-
18 spect to the Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Virginia Area, strike
19 out "\$12,815,000" and insert in place thereof "\$13,979,-
20 000".

21 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
22 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section
23 402 the amounts "\$139,143,000" and "\$266,927,000", and
24 inserting respectively in place thereof "\$140,307,000", and
25 "\$268,091,000".

1 SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
 2 as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202,
 3 “\$70,656,000”, and inserting in place thereof “\$72,785,
 4 000”.

5 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
 6 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
 7 tion 502 the amounts “\$70,656,000”, and “\$210,704,000”
 8 and inserting respectively in place thereof “\$72,785,000”,
 9 and “\$212,833,000”.

10 SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
 11 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
 12 UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:

13 (1) Under the subheading “MARINE CORPS FACILI-
 14 TIES”, with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pen-
 15 dleton, California, strike out “\$648,000” and insert in place
 16 thereof “\$778,000”.

17 (2) Under the subheading “ORDNANCE FACILITIES”,
 18 with respect to the Naval Underwater Ordnance Station,
 19 Newport, Rhode Island, strike out “\$370,000” and insert
 20 in place thereof “\$411,000”.

21 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 22 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CONTI-
 23 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 201, as follows:

24 Under subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES”, with re-
 25 spect to the Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Marianna Is-

1 lands, by striking out “\$6,525,000” and inserting in place
 2 thereof “\$9,063,000” and with respect to the Naval Station,
 3 Argentina, Newfoundland, by striking out “\$8,589,800” and
 4 inserting in place thereof “\$9,089,800”.

5 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 6 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
 7 tion 502 the amounts “\$308,463,600”, “\$108,365,300”, and
 8 “\$575,592,300” and inserting respectively in place thereof
 9 “\$308,634,600”, “\$111,403,300”, and “\$578,801,300”.

10 SEC. 208. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Con-
 11 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading “INSIDE
 12 THE UNITED STATES” in section 201, as follows:

13 (1) Under the subheading “FLEET BASE FACILITIES”
 14 with respect to the Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island,
 15 strike out “\$11,672,000” and insert in place thereof
 16 “\$14,601,000”.

17 (2) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
 18 (Naval Air Training Station)”, with respect to the Naval
 19 Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas, strike out
 20 “\$2,247,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,569,000”;
 21 and with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Merid-
 22 ian, Mississippi, strike out “\$8,231,000” and insert in place
 23 thereof “\$9,141,000”.

24 (3) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
 25 (Marine Corps Air Stations)”, with respect to the Marine

1 Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, strike out
2 “\$170,000” and insert in place thereof “\$273,000”.

3 (4) Under the subheading “SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
4 TIES”, with respect to the Fleet Air Defense Training
5 Center, Dam Neck, Virginia, strike out “\$237,000” and
6 insert in place thereof “\$300,000”, and with respect to the
7 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, strike out
8 “\$8,413,000” and insert in place thereof “\$10,613,000”.

9 (5) Under the subheading “MEDICAL FACILITIES”,
10 with respect to the Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Illinois,
11 strike out “\$12,730,000” and insert in place thereof
12 “\$14,754,000”.

13 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
14 amended, is amended by striking out in section 203
15 “\$85,939,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$86,711,000”.

16 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
17 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
18 tion 402 the amounts “\$303,453,000”, “\$85,939,000”, and
19 “\$451,393,000” and inserting respectively in place thereof
20 “\$312,004,000”, “\$86,711,000”, and “\$460,716,000”.

21 SEC. 209. Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress,
22 is amended under the heading “INSIDE THE UNITED
23 STATES” in section 201 as follows:

1 Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special
2 Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air
3 Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, insert before
4 "\$7,669,000" the words "and land acquisition,".

5 TITLE III

6 SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish
7 or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring,
8 constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing per-
9 manent or temporary public works, including site prepara-
10 tion, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the follow-
11 ing projects:

12 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

13 AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

14 Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Main-
15 tenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate,
16 \$2,649,000.

17 Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont:
18 Troop housing, \$990,000.

19 Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Opera-
20 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
21 facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, utilities, and
22 real estate, \$10,659,000.

1 Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North
2 Dakota: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital
3 facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities,
4 \$4,176,000.

5 K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan:
6 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
7 supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities,
8 troop housing, and utilities, \$10,673,000.

9 Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls Oregon: Community
10 facilities, and utilities, \$229,000.

11 Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan:
12 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
13 supply facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, \$9,948,000.

14 McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington:
15 Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$935,000.

16 Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Main-
17 tenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities,
18 troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,721,000.

19 Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Opera-
20 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop
21 housing, and utilities, \$3,689,000.

22 Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Medical
23 facilities, \$122,000.

24 Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri:
25 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,

1 supply facilities, administrative facilities, and real estate,
2 \$2,799,000.

3 Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan:
4 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and
5 utilities and ground improvements, \$3,579,000.

6 Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach,
7 New York: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

8 Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Troop housing, and
9 ground improvements, \$795,000.

10 Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Opera-
11 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and
12 utilities, \$3,992,000.

13 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Opera-
14 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
15 facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, and utilities,
16 \$8,696,000.

17 AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

18 Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Mainte-
19 nance facilities, and supply facilities, \$975,000.

20 Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational
21 and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate,
22 \$1,177,000.

23 Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and
24 training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing,
25 \$1,746,000.

1 Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Utilities,
2 \$157,000.

3 Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania:
4 Supply facilities, \$94,000.

5 McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California:
6 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
7 supply facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing,
8 \$1,560,000.

9 Memphis General Depot, Memphis, Tennessee: Admin-
10 istrative facilities, \$1,464,000.

11 Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California:
12 Supply facilities, \$658,000.

13 Ohmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania:
14 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
15 medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing,
16 community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$6,169,000.

17 Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational
18 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
19 and utilities, \$4,362,000.

20 Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma:
21 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
22 troop housing, and community facilities, \$5,196,000.

23 Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Oper-
24 ational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, re-

1 search, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and
2 medical facilities, \$11,037,000.

3 AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

4 Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research,
5 development, and test facilities, and utilities, \$981,000.

6 Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational
7 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, de-
8 velopment, and test facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and
9 real estate, \$10,109,000.

10 Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico:
11 Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utili-
12 ties, and real estate, \$1,650,000.

13 Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:
14 Supply facilities, and utilities, \$481,000.

15 Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts:
16 Maintenance facilities, \$165,000.

17 Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational
18 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing,
19 and community facilities, \$2,884,000.

20 SCHOOL OF AVIATION MEDICINE

21 School of Aviation Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base,
22 San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, re-
23 search, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, hos-
24 pital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop

1 housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improve-
2 ments, \$12,000,000.

3 AIR TRAINING COMMAND

4 Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational
5 and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities,
6 \$979,000.

7 Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational
8 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
9 ties, utilities, and real estate, \$1,584,000.

10 Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Troop hous-
11 ing, \$640,000.

12 Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Troop hous-
13 ing, \$400,000.

14 Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi:
15 Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$208,000.

16 James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Troop
17 housing, \$750,000.

18 Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado, or alternate
19 location: Operational and training facilities, administrative
20 facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities,
21 \$5,000,000.

22 Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance
23 facilities, and utilities, \$441,000.

24 Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Oper-

1 ational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
2 \$1,213,000.

3 McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, \$2,119,000.

5 Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Mainte-
6 nance facilities, \$358,000.

7 Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance
8 facilities, \$319,000.

9 Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Oper-
10 ational and training facilities, and utilities, \$245,000.

11 Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Oper-
12 ational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop
13 housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

14 Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Supply facilities,
15 administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$571,000.

16 Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational
17 and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,770,000.

18 Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational
19 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and
20 ground improvements, and real estate, \$3,081,000.

21 Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Opera-
22 tional and training facilities, and maintenance facilities,
23 \$1,361,000.

CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Troop housing, \$1,805,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$11,589,000.

Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Utilities, \$172,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$18,937,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, \$78,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$2,874,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,901,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Troop housing, \$423,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,051,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,280,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,868,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,080,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,654,000.

Brunswick Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$11,417,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,996,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$2,-
2 257,000.

3 Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Operational
4 and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities,
5 utilities, and real estate, \$4,578,000.

6 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma:
7 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
8 supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,-
9 734,000.

10 Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Oper-
11 ational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
12 \$1,939,000.

13 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona:
14 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
15 supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,174,000.

16 Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and
17 training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
18 troop housing, and utilities, \$2,404,000.

19 Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational
20 and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,346,000.

21 Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota:
22 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
23 community facilities, and utilities, \$3,241,000.

24 Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington:
25 Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$4,094,000.

1 Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational
2 and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,
3 and utilities, \$2,703,000.

4 Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Opera-
5 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and
6 ground improvements, \$1,489,000.

7 Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational
8 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
9 \$4,493,000.

10 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana:
11 Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,
12 \$3,401,000.

13 Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington:
14 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
15 supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,795,000.

16 Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational
17 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community
18 facilities, \$897,000.

19 Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Operational
20 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
21 ties, and utilities, \$4,250,000.

22 Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas:
23 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utili-
24 ties, \$3,463,000.

25 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate,
2 \$11,716,000.

3 Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational
4 and training facilities, and utilities, \$3,774,000.

5 MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational
6 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
7 \$3,577,000.

8 Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Op-
9 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
10 facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,832,000.

11 March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Opera-
12 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and
13 real estate, \$3,344,000.

14 McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational
15 and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real
16 estate, \$5,137,000.

17 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home,
18 Idaho: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities,
19 and community facilities, \$1,039,000.

20 Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational
21 and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate
22 \$3,265,000.

23 Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire:
24 Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,
25 \$940,000.

1 Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York:
2 Supply facilities, and utilities, \$208,000.

3 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin:
4 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities;
5 supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and com-
6 munity facilities, \$15,552,000.

7 Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational
8 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,
9 352,000.

10 Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Opera-
11 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,
12 \$2,997,000.

13 Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Opera-
14 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, community
15 facilities, and utilities, \$8,431,000.

16 Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachu-
17 setts: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,345,000.

18 Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Op-
19 erational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities,
20 and real estate, \$5,185,000.

21 TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

22 George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Main-
23 tenance facilities, \$536,000.

24 Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Mainte-
25 nance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,371,000.

1 Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South
 2 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance fa-
 3 cilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,650,000.
 4 Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Troop
 5 housing, \$591,000.

6 Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North
 7 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities,
 8 troop housing, and utilities, \$4,858,000.

9 Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Opera-
 10 tional and training facilities, and maintenance facilities,
 11 \$1,339,000.

12 Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational
 13 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
 14 ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real
 15 estate, \$5,474,000.

16 SPECIAL FACILITIES

17 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
 18 \$563,000.

19 AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

20 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
 21 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities,
 22 administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, com-
 23 munity facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$163,066,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Various locations: Supply facilities, and utilities,
\$696,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training
facilities, \$380,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training
facilities, \$710,000.

King Salmon Airport: Operational and training facilities,
\$340,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities,
administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities,
utilities and ground improvements, and real estate,
\$24,986,000.

CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and
training facilities, \$1,540,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
communities facilities, and utilities, \$5,347,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$144,000.

Midway Island: Supply facilities, \$839,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$15,688,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Anderson Air Force Base, Guam: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,508,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$643,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$21,431,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$19,952,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities,

1 administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, com-
2 munity facilities, and utilities, \$29,135,000.

3 SPECIAL FACILITIES

4 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
5 \$315,000.

6 SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish
7 or develop classified military installations and facilities for
8 ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles by acquiring, con-
9 structing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent
10 or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
11 preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the
12 total amount of \$287,500,000.

13 SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish
14 or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceed-
15 ing with construction made necessary by changes in Air
16 Force missions, new weapons developments, new and un-
17 foreseen research and development requirements, or im-
18 proved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense de-
19 termines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in
20 the next military construction authorization Act would be
21 inconsistent with interests of national security, and in con-
22 nection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate,
23 or install permanent or temporary public works, including
24 land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities,

1 and equipment, in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Pro-*
 2 *vided,* That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee,
 3 shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate
 4 and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching
 5 a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of
 6 any public work undertaken under this section, including
 7 those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

8 SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of
 9 section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119,
 10 1125), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is author-
 11 ized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family
 12 housing for occupancy as public quarters and community
 13 facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign cur-
 14 rencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricul-
 15 tural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68
 16 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the
 17 Commodity Credit Corporation:

18 Lajes Field, Azores, 306 units.

19 Kindley Air Force Base, Bermuda, 300 units.

20 Laon, France, 102 units.

21 Keflavik Airport, Iceland, 300 units.

22 Benguerir Airport, Morocco, 248 units.

23 Sidi Slimane Air Base, Morocco, 295 units.

24 Clark Air Force Base, Philippines, 900 units.

25 Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, 200 units.

- 1 Madrid-Torrejon area, Spain, 460 units.
- 2 Moron-San Pablo area, Spain, 40 units.
- 3 Various locations, Spain, 120 units, and community
- 4 facilities.
- 5 Zaragoza Air Base, Spain, 176 units.
- 6 Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 50 units.
- 7 Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 190 units.
- 8 Bruntingthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 93
- 9 units.
- 10 Brize Norton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 215 units.
- 11 Chelveston RAF Station, United Kingdom, 79 units.
- 12 Chicksands Priory RAF Station, United Kingdom, 83
- 13 units.
- 14 Fairford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 177 units.
- 15 High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 110
- 16 units.
- 17 Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 55 units,
- 18 and community facilities.
- 19 Stansted Mountfitchet RAF Station, United Kingdom,
- 20 22 units.
- 21 Upper Heyford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 259
- 22 Units.
- 23 Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, 416 units.
- 24 (b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of
- 25 the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as

1 amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to
2 construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters
3 at the following locations:

4 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

- 5 Camp Adair Air Force Station, 150 units.
6 Amarillo Air Force Base, Texas, 500 units.
7 Beale Air Force Base, California, 970 units.
8 Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 250 units.
9 Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, 450 units.
10 Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 536 units.
11 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 50 units.
12 Custer Air Force Station, Michigan, 169 units.
13 Donaldson Air Force Base, South Carolina, 275 units.
14 Cooke Air Force Base, California, 525 units.
15 Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 500 units.
16 Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 530 units.
17 Duluth Municipal Airport, Minnesota, 365 units.
18 Edwards Air Force Base, California, 778 units.
19 Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 220 units.
20 Forbes Air Force Base, Kansas, 414 units.
21 Fort Lee Air Force Station, Virginia, 154 units.
22 Geiger Field, Washington, 168 units.
23 Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 460 units.
24 Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 744 units.
25 Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, 270 units.

- 1 Hamilton Air Force Base, California, 550 units.
- 2 Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, 400 units.
- 3 James Connally Air Force Base, Texas, 366 units.
- 4 Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 290 units.
- 5 Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 475 units.
- 6 K. I. Sawyer Airport, Michigan, 595 units.
- 7 Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, 490 units.
- 8 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Louisiana, 300 units.
- 9 Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, 500 units.
- 10 Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 200 units.
- 11 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio, 400 units.
- 12 Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 150 units.
- 13 Mather Air Force Base, California, 220 units.
- 14 McChord Air Force Base, Washington, 1,000 units.
- 15 McClellan Air Force Base, California, 540 units.
- 16 McCoy Air Force Base, Florida, 668 units.
- 17 McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, 1,450 units.
- 18 Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 932 units.
- 19 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 270 units.
- 20 Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, 200 units.
- 21 Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, New York 290 units.
- 22 Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 616 units.
- 23 Oxnard Air Force Base, California, 315 units.
- 24 Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, 483 units.
- 25 Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.

- 1 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wisconsin, 900 units.
- 2 Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Missouri, 610 units.
- 3 Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, 150 units.
- 4 Selfridge Air Force Base, Michigan, 580 units.
- 5 Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas, 500 units.
- 6 Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa, 235 units.
- 7 Stewart Air Force Base, New York, 300 units.
- 8 Suffolk County Air Force Base, New York, 220 units.
- 9 Syracuse Air Force Station, New York, 216 units.
- 10 Topsham Air Force Station, Maine, 177 units.
- 11 Truax Field, Wisconsin, 280 units.
- 12 Turner Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units.
- 13 United States Air Force Academy, Colorado, 300 units.
- 14 Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 230 units.
- 15 Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts, 310 units.
- 16 Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 154 units.
- 17 Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, 150 units.
- 18 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 618 units.

19 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

- 20 Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, 1,050 units.
- 21 Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, 600 units.
- 22 (c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404
- 23 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652),
- 24 as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized
- 25 to acquire family housing at the following locations:

1 Brookley Air Force Base, Alabama, 175 units.
2 Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, 600 units.
3 Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 225 units.
4 Davis Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, 550 units.
5 Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, 500
6 units.

7 Hunter Air Force Base, Georgia, 500 units.

8 Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, 592.

9 Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, 480 units.

10 March Air Force Base, California, 644 units.

11 Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, 250 units.

12 Mitchel Air Force Base, New York, 628 units.

13 Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, 612 units.

14 Reese Air Force Base, Texas, 418 units.

15 Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, 400 units.

16 Walker Air Force Base, New Mexico, 800 units.

17 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, 2,000 units.

18 SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-
19 gress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "CONTI-
20 NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

21 Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND", with
22 respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts,
23 strike out "\$6,076,000," and insert in place thereof "\$6,-
24 522,000".

25 Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND",

1 with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton,
 2 Ohio, strike out “\$14,508,000” and insert in place thereof
 3 “\$15,800,000”.

4 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 5 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
 6 tion 502 the amounts “\$824,300,000” and “\$1,363,-
 7 189,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$826,038,000”
 8 and “\$1,364,927,000”, respectively.

9 SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
 10 as amended, is amended, under the heading “INSIDE THE
 11 UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

12 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

13 (1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport,
 14 Duluth, Minnesota, strike out “\$1,469,000” and insert
 15 in place thereof “\$1,636,000”.

16 (2) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Fal-
 17 mouth, Massachusetts, strike out “\$11,577,000” and
 18 insert in place thereof “\$13,341,000”.

19 Under the subheading “AIR MATERIEL COMMAND”, with
 20 respect to Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, strike out
 21 “\$1,339,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,661,000”.

22 Under the subheading “AIR TRAINING COMMAND”, with
 23 respect to James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas,
 24 strike out “\$4,687,000” and insert in place thereof “\$5,-
 25 301,000”.

1 Under the subheading “STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND”,
 2 with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls,
 3 Montana, strike out “\$1,586,000” and insert in place thereof
 4 “\$1,726,000”.

5 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 6 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section
 7 402 the amounts “\$811,342,000” and “\$1,447,950,000”
 8 and inserting in place thereof “\$814,349,000” and “\$1,450,-
 9 957,000”, respectively.

10 SEC. 307. (a) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Con-
 11 gress, is amended, under the heading “INSIDE THE UNITED
 12 STATES” in section 301, as follows:

13 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

14 (1) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glas-
 15 gow, Montana, strike out “\$2,048,000” and insert in
 16 place thereof “\$2,390,000”.

17 (2) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base,
 18 Kansas City, Missouri, strike out “\$1,100,000” and in-
 19 sert in place thereof “\$1,348,000”.

20 (3) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot,
 21 North Dakota, strike out “\$6,804,000” and insert in
 22 place thereof “\$8,507,000”.

23 (4) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth,
 24 Massachusetts, strike out “\$559,000” and insert in place
 25 thereof “\$615,000”.

1 Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND",
 2 with respect to Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas,
 3 strike out "\$899,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,128,
 4 000".

5 Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND", with
 6 respect to Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas, strike out
 7 "\$460,000" and insert in place thereof "\$637,000".

8 Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

9 (1) with respect to Barksdale Air Force Base,
 10 Shreveport, Louisiana, strike out "\$3,344,000" and
 11 insert in place thereof "\$3,633,000".

12 (2) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marys-
 13 ville, California, strike out "\$7,458,000" and insert in
 14 place thereof "\$9,087,000".

15 (3) with respect to MacDill Air Force Base,
 16 Tampa, Florida, strike out "\$936,000" and insert in
 17 place thereof "\$1,268,000".

18 (4) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base,
 19 Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out "\$2,344,000"
 20 and insert in place thereof "\$2,947,000".

21 (5) with respect to Whiteman Air Force Base,
 22 Knob Noster, Missouri, strike out "\$235,000" and insert
 23 in place thereof "\$306,000".

24 (b) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is

1 amended by striking out in clause ~~(3)~~ of section 502 the
 2 amounts “\$394,076,000” and “\$601,781,000” and inserting
 3 in place thereof “\$399,755,000” and “\$607,460,000”,
 4 respectively.

5 SEC. 308. ~~(a)~~ Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Con-
 6 gress, is amended, under the heading “ALERT AND DISPER-
 7 SAL OF STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND FORCES” in section 1,
 8 as follows:

9 ~~(1)~~ with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base,
 10 Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out “\$895,000”
 11 and insert in place thereof, \$1,892,000”.

12 ~~(2)~~ with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot,
 13 North Dakota, strike out “\$867,000” and insert in
 14 place thereof “\$1,479,000”.

15 ~~(3)~~ with respect to Mountain Home Air Force
 16 Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out “\$4,380,000”
 17 and insert in place thereof “\$5,479,000”.

18 ~~(4)~~ with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha,
 19 Nebraska, strike out “\$690,000” and insert in place
 20 thereof “\$969,000”.

21 ~~(b)~~ Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Congress, is
 22 amended by striking out in section 3 the amount “\$549,-
 23 670,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$552,657,000”.

24 SEC. 309. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act,

1 as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking
2 out in the first sentence the figure “\$135,425,000” and in-
3 serting in place thereof the figure “\$139,797,000”.

4 SEC. 310. The last paragraph under the heading “RE-
5 SEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND” in title III of
6 Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress (69 Stat. 342),
7 is amended to read as follows:

8 “Various Locations: Research, development, and opera-
9 tional facilities (including not more than \$357,000 for an
10 off-base roadway approximately ten miles in length in the
11 vicinity of the north boundary of Cape Canaveral—an aux-
12 iliary to Patrick Air Force Base), \$20,000,000.”

13 The amendment made by this section is effective from
14 March 1, 1956.

15 TITLE IV

16 SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or
17 develop installations and facilities required for advanced
18 research projects and in connection therewith may acquire,
19 construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or
20 temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
21 preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the
22 total amount of \$50,000,000.

23 The Secretary of Defense shall report in detail semi-

1 annually to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker
2 of the House of Representatives with respect to the exer-
3 cise of the authority granted by this title.

4 TITLE V

5 GENERAL PROVISIONS

6 SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary
7 of each military department may proceed to establish or
8 develop installations and facilities under this Act without
9 regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as
10 amended (31 U. S. C. 529, 40 U. S. C. 259, 267), and
11 sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States
12 Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary im-
13 provements on land includes authority for surveys, admin-
14 istration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to
15 construction. The authority may be exercised before title
16 to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised
17 Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C. 255), and even though
18 the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real
19 estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to
20 acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary
21 use) by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned
22 land, or otherwise.

23 SEC. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such

1 sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but
 2 appropriations, for public works projects authorized by titles
 3 I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

4 ~~(1)~~ for title I: Inside the United States,
 5 \$112,218,000; outside the United States, \$8,732,000;
 6 section 102, \$201,121,000; section 103, \$10,000,000;
 7 or a total of \$332,071,000.

8 ~~(2)~~ for title II: Inside the United States,
 9 \$217,363,000; outside the United States, \$16,384,000;
 10 Section 202, \$75,301,000; section 203, \$10,000,000;
 11 or a total of \$319,048,000.

12 ~~(3)~~ for title III: Inside the United States,
 13 \$536,218,000; outside the United States, \$123,654,000;
 14 section 302, \$287,500,000; section 303, \$10,000,000;
 15 or a total of \$957,372,000.

16 ~~(4)~~ for title IV: \$50,000,000.

17 SEC. 503. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and
 18 III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary con-
 19 cerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside
 20 the United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside
 21 the United States. However, the total cost of all projects
 22 in each such title may not be more than the total amount
 23 authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

24 SEC. 504. Any outstanding authority heretofore pro-
 25 vided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119),

1 the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of
2 August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991), for the provision of family
3 housing shall be available for the construction of family
4 housing at any installations for which appropriated fund
5 family housing is authorized to be constructed under titles
6 I and III of this Act.

7 SEC. 505. ~~Whenever—~~

8 ~~(1) the President determines that compliance with~~
9 ~~section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for~~
10 ~~contracts made under this Act for the establishment or~~
11 ~~development of military installations and facilities in~~
12 ~~foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of~~
13 ~~this Act; and~~

14 ~~(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller~~
15 ~~General have agreed upon alternative methods of ade-~~
16 ~~quately auditing those contracts; the President may~~
17 ~~exempt those contracts from the requirements of that~~
18 ~~section.~~

19 SEC. 506. Contracts made by the United States under
20 this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a com-
21 petitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national
22 security will not be impaired and the award is consistent
23 with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and sec-
24 tion 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547, 551).
25 The Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the mili-

1 tary departments shall report semi-annually to the Presi-
 2 dent of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Repre-
 3 sentatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other
 4 than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

5 SEC. 507. As of July 1, 1959, all authorization for mili-
 6 tary public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of
 7 a military department in connection with the establishment
 8 or development of military installations and facilities, and all
 9 authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained
 10 in Acts approved before August 4, 1956, and not superseded
 11 or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed,
 12 except—

13 ~~(1)~~ Authorizations for public works and for appro-
 14 priations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the
 15 titles that contain the general provisions;

16 ~~(2)~~ the authorization for public works projects
 17 as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for
 18 construction contracts or land acquisition in whole or
 19 in part before July 1, 1959, and authorizations for
 20 appropriations therefor;

21 ~~(3)~~ the authorization for the rental guaranty for
 22 family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is
 23 contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952
 24 ~~(66 Stat. 606, 622)~~;

25 ~~(4)~~ the authorizations for public works and the

1 appropriation of funds that are contained in sections
2 2231-2238 of title 40, United States Code, as amended
3 (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886);

4 (5) the authorization for the development of the
5 Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$30,-
6 000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the
7 Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

8 (6) the authorization for development of classified
9 facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in
10 title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951
11 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

12 (7) the authorization for public works and for the
13 appropriation of funds that are contained in the Act of
14 April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended; and

15 (8) notwithstanding the provision of section 506 of
16 the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 558), the
17 authorization for:

18 (a) jet engine test cells in the amount of \$1,-
19 850,000 at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia,
20 that is contained in title II, section 201 under the
21 heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and sub-
22 heading "AVIATION FACILITIES" of the Act of
23 August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 440, 442), as amended;

24 (b) ammunition storage facilities in the

1 amount of \$225,000 at the Naval Auxiliary Air
2 Station, El Centro, California; navigational aids in
3 the amount of \$590,000 at the Marine Corps Air
4 Station, El Toro, California; research and develop-
5 ment facilities in the amount of \$1,804,000 at the
6 Naval Air Turbine Test Station, Trenton, New
7 Jersey; and navigational aids in the amount of
8 \$400,000 at the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island,
9 Washington: that are contained in title II, section
10 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED
11 STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES"
12 of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 540),
13 as amended.

14 SEC. 508. Section 408 (b) of the Act of June 17, 1950
15 (64 Stat. 236, 245), is hereby repealed.

16 SEC. 509. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955
17 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to
18 read as follows:

19 "SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1958 through and in-
20 cluding 1961, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air-
21 Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities
22 at or near military tactical installations for assignments as
23 public quarters to military personnel and their dependents,
24 if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the
25 Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack

1 of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical
 2 installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a
 3 family or individual unit basis and not more than five thou-
 4 sand of such units may be so leased at any one time. Ex-
 5 penditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be
 6 made out of appropriations available for maintenance and
 7 operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such
 8 unit.”

9 SEC. 510. Section 406 of the Act of August 3, 1956
 10 (70 Stat. 991, 1015), is amended to read as follows:

11 “SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of a military department
 12 may acquire any interest in land that—

13 “(1) he or his designee determines is needed in the
 14 interest of national defense; and

15 “(2) does not cost more than \$25,000 (exclusive of
 16 administrative costs and the amounts of any deficiency
 17 judgments).”

18 This section does not authorize the acquisition, as part of
 19 the same project, of two or more contiguous parcels of land
 20 that together cost more than \$25,000.”

21 SEC. 511. Section 408 (a) of the Act of August 3,
 22 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), is amended by adding the fol-
 23 lowing new subsection at the end thereof:

24 “(5) No determination that a project is urgently re-
 25 quired shall be necessary for projects, the cost of which is
 26 not in excess of \$5,000.”

1 SEC. 512. Subsection ~~(a)~~ of section 406 of the Act
2 of August 30, 1957 ~~(71 Stat. 531, 556)~~, is amended to read
3 as follows:

4 “~~(a)~~ Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law,
5 and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be
6 contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installa-
7 tions or activities unless the actual number of units involved
8 has been specifically authorized by an annual military con-
9 struction authorization Act except ~~(1)~~ housing units required
10 to be acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404
11 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; ~~(2)~~ housing units
12 leased, utilizing available operation and maintenance appro-
13 priations, for terms of one year, whether renewable or not,
14 or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the pro-
15 visions of section 417 of the Act of August 3, 1956 ~~(70 Stat.~~
16 ~~991, 1018)~~; and ~~(3)~~ rental guaranty family housing author-
17 ized under section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 ~~(66 Stat.~~
18 ~~606, 622)~~; and ~~(4)~~ to the extent that any of the author-
19 ization of subsection 104 ~~(b)~~, 204 ~~(b)~~, and 304 ~~(b)~~ of
20 this Act to construct housing at locations specified therein
21 are not utilized, such authorization may be exercised to con-
22 struct housing at other locations: *Provided*, That the total
23 number of housing units to be constructed under the authority
24 of this subsection may not exceed for any service 10 per
25 centum of the total number of units authorized in its sub-

1 section: *Provided, further,* That the Secretaries of the three
 2 military departments, or the designee of each, shall notify
 3 the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House
 4 of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision
 5 to utilize the authority granted by this section.

6 TITLE VI

7 RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

8 SEC. 601. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as
 9 follows:

10 ~~(1)~~ That part of section 2233 ~~(a)~~ that precedes clause
 11 ~~(1)~~ thereof is amended to read as follows:

12 “§ 2233. Acquisition

13 “~~(a)~~ Subject to sections 2233a, 2234, 2235, 2236, and
 14 2238 of this title and subsection ~~(c)~~ of this section, the
 15 Secretary of Defense may—”.

16 ~~(2)~~ Section 2233 is amended by adding the following
 17 new subsections at the end thereof:

18 “~~(c)~~ The Secretary of Defense may procure advance
 19 planning, construction design, and architectural services in
 20 connection with facilities to be established or developed under
 21 this chapter which are not otherwise authorized by law.”

22 “~~(f)~~ Facilities authorized by subsection ~~(a)~~ shall not
 23 be considered ‘military public works’ under the provisions of
 24 the military construction authorization acts that repeal prior
 25 authorizations for military public works.”

1 (3) The following new section is inserted after section
2 2233:

3 “§ 2233a. Limitation

4 “No expenditure or contribution that is more than
5 \$50,000 may be made under section 2233 of this title for
6 any facility that has not been authorized by a law authoriz-
7 ing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces.
8 This requirement does not apply to the following:

9 “(a) Facilities acquired by lease.

10 “(b) Facilities acquired, constructed, expanded, re-
11 habilitated, converted, or equipped to restore or replace
12 facilities damaged or destroyed, where the Senate and the
13 House of Representatives have been notified of that action.”

14 (4) The analysis of chapter 133 is amended by inserting
15 the following new item:

“2233a. Limitation.”

16 SEC. 602 (a) Section 3 of the National Defense Facil-
17 ities Act of 1950, as amended by paragraph (a) of the Act
18 of August 9, 1955, chapter 662 (69 Stat. 593), and by
19 section 2 of the Act of August 29, 1957, Public Law 85-215
20 (71 Stat. 489), is amended by striking out the words “in an
21 amount not to exceed \$580,000,000 over a period of the next
22 eight fiscal years commencing with fiscal year 1951,”.

23 (b) Section 3 (a) of the National Defense Facilities

1 Act of 1950, as amended by section 414 of the Act of
 2 August 3, 1956, chapter 939 (70 Stat. 1018), is amended
 3 by striking out the words "and without regard to the mone-
 4 tary limitation otherwise imposed by this section".

5 SEC. 603. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United
 6 States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or de-
 7 velop the following facilities for reserve forces:

8 (1) For Department of the Navy:

9 NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

10 Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta,
 11 Georgia: Training facilities, \$480,000.

12 Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Supply facilities and
 13 utilities, \$259,000.

14 Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance fa-
 15 cilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$652,000.

16 Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Navigational aids
 17 and utilities, \$179,000.

18 Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Airfield light-
 19 ing, \$147,000.

20 Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Opera-
 21 tional and training facilities, liquid fueling and dispensing fa-
 22 cilities, airfield lighting, and land acquisition, \$1,992,000.

23 Naval Air Station, New Orleans (Alvin Callender
 24 Field), Louisiana: Administrative facilities, community fa-

1 utilities, navigational aids, operational facilities, supply facili-
 2 ties, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,447,000.

3 Naval Air Station, New York, New York: Airfield
 4 lighting, \$130,000.

5 Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Opera-
 6 tional and training facilities, and utilities, \$652,000.

7 Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational and
 8 training facilities, \$570,000.

9 Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts:
 10 Utilities, \$407,000.

11 Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Utili-
 12 ties, \$99,000.

13 NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

14 Alameda, California: Waterfront operational facilities,
 15 \$128,000.

16 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Bloomington, In-
 17 diana: Training facilities, \$95,000.

18 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Bos-
 19 ton, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$108,000.

20 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Centralia, Washing-
 21 ton: Training facilities, \$81,000.

22 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Chillicothe, Ohio:
 23 Training facilities, \$100,000.

24 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Danville, Ken-
 25 tucky: Training facilities, \$84,000.

1 Naval Reserve Training Center, Dunkirk, New York:
2 Training facilities, \$79,000.

3 Fort Schuyler, New York: Waterfront operational facili-
4 ties, \$120,000.

5 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Hayward, Califor-
6 nia: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$99,000.

7 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center,
8 Honolulu, Hawaii: Training facilities, \$515,000.

9 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Iowa City, Iowa:
10 Training facilities, \$97,000.

11 Master Control Radio Station, New Orleans, Louisiana:
12 Communications, \$210,000.

13 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Olympia (Tum-
14 water), Washington: Training facilities, \$47,000.

15 Naval Reserve Training Center, Pasadena, California:
16 Training facilities, \$132,000.

17 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Port Chicago, Cali-
18 fornia: Training facilities, \$94,000.

19 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San
20 Jose, California: Land acquisition, \$78,000.

21 Saint Petersburg, Florida: Waterfront operational facili-
22 ties, \$26,000.

23 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center,
24 Steubenville, Ohio: Land acquisition, \$18,000.

1 Naval Reserve Training Center, White Oak (Lewiston),
2 Maryland: Training facilities, \$557,000.

3 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Yakima, Washing-
4 ton: Training facilities, \$48,000.

5 MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)

6 Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Lynchburg,
7 Virginia: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$388,000.

8 Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Memphis, Ten-
9 nessee: Training facilities, \$453,000.

10 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center,
11 Moline, Illinois: Training facilities, \$152,000.

12 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center,
13 Pasadena, California: Training facilities, \$163,000.

14 (2) For Department of the Air Force:

15 AIR FORCE RESERVE

16 Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland:
17 Operational and training facilities, \$129,000.

18 Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Opera-
19 tional and training facilities, utilities and ground improve-
20 ments, and land acquisition, \$3,174,000.

21 Bates Field, Mobile, Alabama: Maintenance facility,
22 \$97,000.

23 Bradley Field, Windsor Locks, Connecticut: Mainte-
24 nance facility and utilities and ground improvements,
25 \$160,000.

1 Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Maintenance facility,
2 and supply facility, \$325,000.

3 General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Main-
4 tenance facility, and operational and training facilities,
5 \$173,000.

6 Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, New Hampshire:
7 Operational and training facilities, \$180,000.

8 Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Belton, Missouri:
9 Operational and training facilities, \$101,000.

10 Naval Air Station (Alvin Callender Field), Orleans
11 Parish, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities,
12 \$622,000.

13 Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Main-
14 tenance facility, \$93,000.

15 AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

16 Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational
17 and training facilities, and hospital and medical facilities,
18 \$171,000.

19 Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts: Operational and
20 training facilities, \$740,000.

21 Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel, Minnesota:
22 Site improvements, \$500,000.

23 Birmingham Municipal Airport, Birmingham, Alabama:
24 Operational and training facilities, \$150,000.

1 Byrd Field, Richmond, Virginia: Supply facilities,
2 \$50,000.

3 Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational
4 and training facilities, \$579,000.

5 Capital Airport, Springfield, Illinois: Supply facilities,
6 \$78,000.

7 Des Moines Municipal Airport, Des Moines, Iowa:
8 Operational and training facilities, \$53,000.

9 Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Operational and
10 training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and
11 utilities and ground improvements, \$1,308,000.

12 Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, New Hampshire:
13 Operational and training facilities, \$170,000.

14 Gulfport Municipal Airport, Gulfport, Mississippi:
15 Supply facilities, \$362,000.

16 Hayward Municipal Airport, Hayward, California:
17 Operational and training facilities, \$113,000.

18 Hensley Field, Grand Prairie, Texas: Operational and
19 training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,862,000.

20 Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational and train-
21 ing facilities, and supply facilities, \$159,000.

22 Kellogg Field, Battle Creek, Michigan: Operational and
23 training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and
24 ground improvement, \$1,136,000.

25 Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:

1 Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,
2 \$570,000.

3 Martinsburg Municipal Airport, Martinsburg, West Vir-
4 ginia: Operational and training facilities, \$123,000.

5 O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Opera-
6 tional and training facilities, \$1,099,000.

7 Ontario International Airport, Ontario, California:
8 Operational and training facilities, \$127,000.

9 Portland Municipal Airport, Portland, Oregon: Supply
10 facilities and maintenance facilities, \$233,000.

11 Rosecrans Field, Saint Joseph, Missouri: Operational and
12 training facilities, and supply facilities, \$123,000.

13 San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico:
14 Supply facilities, \$70,000.

15 Sky Harbor Airport, Phoenix, Arizona: Operational and
16 training facilities, \$655,000.

17 Standiford Field, Louisville, Kentucky: Operational and
18 training facilities, and administrative facilities, \$715,000.

19 Theodore F. Green Airport, Providence, Rhode Island:
20 Operational and training facilities, \$213,000.

21 Travis Field, Savannah, Georgia: Housing, supply fa-
22 cilities and utilities, \$317,000.

23 Various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, \$300,000.

24 (3) For Department of the Army:

ARMY RESERVE

- 1
- 2 Batavia, New York: Training facilities, \$171,000.
- 3 Beckley, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$289,000.
- 4 Beloit, Wisconsin: Training facilities, \$157,000.
- 5 Canandaigua, New York: Training facilities, \$171,000.
- 6 Canton, Ohio: Training facilities, \$40,000.
- 7 Cheyenne, Wyoming: Training facilities, \$149,000.
- 8 Durant, Oklahoma: Training facilities, \$141,000.
- 9 Fargo, North Dakota: Training facilities, \$149,000.
- 10 Fremont, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.
- 11 Galesburg, Illinois: Training facilities, \$157,000.
- 12 Greenwood, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$85,000.
- 13 Hempstead, New York (Nr2): Training facilities,
- 14 \$536,000.
- 15 Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$99,000.
- 16 Kewaunee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, \$157,000.—
- 17 Madison, Wisconsin (Nr2): Training facilities,
- 18 \$490,000.
- 19 Oklahoma City, Oklahoma (Nr2): Training facilities,
- 20 \$443,000.
- 21 Saint Marys, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.
- 22 Saint Marys, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$149,000.
- 23 Salinas, California: Training facilities, \$164,000.
- 24 Sinton, Texas: Training facilities, \$134,000.
- 25 Stockton, California: Training facilities, \$164,000.

- 1 Warren, Ohio: Training facilities, \$289,000.
- 2 Weirton, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$149,000.
- 3 San Jose, California: Road improvements, \$32,000.
- 4 Land acquisition: Training facilities, \$419,000.

5 ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

6 (ARMORY)

- 7 Ackerman, Mississippi: Training facilities, \$54,000.
- 8 Agawam, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$170,000.
- 9 Ashford, Alabama: Training facilities, \$70,000.
- 10 Beckley, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$200,000.
- 11 Belton, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$122,000.
- 12 Berryville, Arkansas: Training facilities, \$45,000.
- 13 Berryville, Virginia: Training facilities, \$135,000.
- 14 Bethel, Alaska: Training facilities, \$480,000.
- 15 Caldwell, Ohio: Training facilities, \$135,000.
- 16 Calhoun, Georgia: Training facilities, \$110,000.
- 17 Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$206,000.
- 18 Espanola, New Mexico: Training facilities, \$57,000.
- 19 Fairbanks, Alaska: Training facilities, \$277,000.
- 20 Gainesville, Texas: Training facilities, \$111,000.
- 21 Hollister, California: Training facilities, \$105,000.
- 22 Honey Grove, Texas: Training facilities, \$90,000.
- 23 Juneos, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, \$38,000.
- 24 Livingston, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
- 25 Lovell, Wyoming: Training facilities, \$142,000.

- 1 Mayaguez, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, \$160,000.
- 2 Middleboro, Kentucky: Training facilities, \$130,000.
- 3 Northwest Saint Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities,
- 4 \$130,000.
- 5 Pitman, New Jersey: Training facilities, \$175,000.
- 6 Rigby, Idaho: Training facilities, \$57,000.
- 7 Salem, South Dakota: Training facilities, \$150,000.
- 8 Saranac Lake, New York: Training facilities, \$300,000.
- 9 Shallotte, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$95,000.
- 10 Smithfield, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.
- 11 South Portland, Maine: Training facilities, \$150,000.
- 12 Sturgis, Michigan: Training facilities, \$220,000.
- 13 Swanton, Vermont: Training facilities, \$137,000.
- 14 Valparaiso, Indiana: Training facilities, \$188,000.
- 15 Whitman, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$170,000.
- 16 Whitmire, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000
- 17 Winnemucca, Nevada: Training facilities, \$110,000.

18 ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (NON-
 19 ARMORY)

- 20 Augusta, Maine: Administrative facilities, \$90,000.
- 21 Burlington, Vermont: Supply facilities, \$208,000.
- 22 Camp Beauregard, Louisiana: Supply facilities, \$325,-
- 23 000.
- 24 Camp Dodge, Iowa: Supply facilities, \$120,000.
- 25 Concord, New Hampshire: Supply facilities, \$145,000.

1 Kalispell, Montana: Maintenance facilities, \$67,000.

2 Trenton, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, \$80,000.

3 ~~(4)~~ For all reserve components: Facilities made nec-
 4 essary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equip-
 5 ment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his
 6 designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclu-
 7 sion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific
 8 facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the in-
 9 terests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense
 10 or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Repre-
 11 sentatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to
 12 implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility
 13 to be undertaken under this subsection.

14 SEC. 604. The first sentence of section 2233a of title 10,
 15 United States Code, does not apply to—

16 ~~(a)~~ facilities that—

17 ~~(1)~~ have been the subject of consultation with
 18 the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the
 19 House of Representatives before July 1, 1958;

20 ~~(2)~~ are under contract before July 1, 1960; and

21 ~~(3)~~ are funded from appropriations made before
 22 the date of enactment of this Act; or

23 ~~(b)~~ facilities that are authorized by section 603 ~~(4)~~ of
 24 this Act; or

1 ~~(c)~~ The following facilities for the Air National Guard
2 of the United States:

3 ~~(1)~~ Milford Point, Connecticut: Operational and train-
4 ing facilities, \$337,000.

5 ~~(2)~~ Wellesley, Massachusetts: Operational and training
6 facilities, \$319,000.

7 ~~(3)~~ Westchester County Airport, White Plains, New
8 York: Operational and training facilities, \$105,000.

9 SEC. 605. The Secretary of Defense may establish or
10 develop installations and facilities under this Title without
11 regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes,
12 as amended, and section 4774 ~~(d)~~ and 9774 ~~(d)~~ of title 10,
13 United States Code. The authority to place permanent or
14 temporary improvements on land includes authority for sur-
15 veys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision
16 incident to construction. That authority may be exercised
17 before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the
18 Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is
19 held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or
20 land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land,
21 and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift,
22 purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

23 SEC. 606. Appropriations for facilities projects author-
24 ized by section 603 for the respective reserve components
25 of the armed forces may not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$11,886,000.

(2) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air Force Reserve, \$5,054,000;

(b) Air National Guard of the United States, \$11,976,000.

(3) for Department of the Army: Army Reserve and Army National Guard of the United States, \$11,042,000.

SEC. 607. Any of the amounts named in section 603 of this Act may in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses 1, 2 (a), 2 (b), and 3 of section 606 respectively.

SEC. 608. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1958".

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation,

1 appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following
2 projects:

3 *INSIDE THE UNITED STATES*

4 *TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES*

5 *(Ordnance Corps)*

6 *Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing,*
7 *and utilities, \$2,697,000.*

8 *Detroit Arsenal, Michigan: Administrative facilities,*
9 *\$5,666,000.*

10 *Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Administrative facilities,*
11 *troop housing, and utilities, \$8,529,000.*

12 *Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois: Operational and training*
13 *facilities, \$570,000.*

14 *White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico: Operational*
15 *and training facilities, research, development and test facili-*
16 *ties, medical facilities, troop housing, and community facili-*
17 *ties, \$7,931,000.*

18 *(Quartermaster Corps)*

19 *Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational and training facilities,*
20 *and troop housing, \$4,630,000.*

21 *(Chemical Corps)*

22 *Army Chemical Center, Maryland: Troop housing, and*
23 *utilities, \$2,051,000.*

24 *Fort Detrick, Maryland: Troop housing, \$795,000.*

1 (Signal Corps)

2 Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, re-
3 search, development, and test facilities, administrative fa-
4 cilities, troop housing, operational and training facilities, and
5 utilities, \$9,098,000.

6 (Corps of Engineers)

7 Army Map Service, Maryland: Operational and train-
8 ing facilities, \$1,913,000.

9 (Transportation Corps)

10 Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational and training facili-
11 ties, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities,
12 \$3,634,000.

13 (Medical Corps)

14 Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Troop housing,
15 \$862,000.

16 FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

17 (First Army Area)

18 Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational and training
19 facilities, \$171,000.

20 Fort Dix, New Jersey: Troop housing and utilities,
21 \$3,749,000.

22 (Second Army Area)

23 Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: Family housing, and
24 real estate, \$374,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$516,000.

Fort Meade, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, \$498,000.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Supply facilities, \$43,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and family housing, \$3,454,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$762,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and administrative facilities, \$847,000.

Fort McClellan, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, \$174,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,406,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$13,734,000,...

1 *Fort Hood, Texas: Operational and training facilities,*
2 *maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-*
3 *ties, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,258,000.*

4 *Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities,*
5 *maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities,*
6 *\$3,227,000.*

7 *(Fifth Army Area)*

8 *Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Troop housing, and*
9 *family housing, \$783,000.*

10 *Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Operational and training*
11 *facilities, and troop housing, \$1,076,000.*

12 *Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational and training facilities,*
13 *and utilities, \$1,084,000.*

14 *(Sixth Army Area)*

15 *Camp Desert Rock, Nevada: Maintenance facilities,*
16 *and utilities, \$374,000.*

17 *Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational and training*
18 *facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,085,000.*

19 *Fort Ord, California: Operational and training facili-*
20 *ties, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,*
21 *community facilities, and utilities, \$4,733,000.*

22 *Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Operational and training*
23 *facilities, \$173,000.*

1 *(Military Academy)*

2 *United States Military Academy, West Point, New*
3 *York: Troop housing, medical facilities, and community*
4 *facilities, \$5,844,000.*

5 *(Armed Forces Special Weapons)*

6 *Various locations: Maintenance facilities, community*
7 *facilities, and utilities, \$273,000.*

8 *(Tactical Installations Support Facilities)*

9 *Various locations: Maintenance facilities, \$6,311,000.*

10 *OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES*

11 *(Alaskan Area)*

12 *Fairbanks Permafrost Research Area: Real estate,*
13 *\$7,000.*

14 *(Pacific Command Area)*

15 *Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: Operational and training*
16 *facilities, \$240,000.*

17 *Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Troop housing, \$593,000.*

18 *Fort Shafter, Hawaii: Supply facilities, maintenance*
19 *facilities, family housing, and community facilities, \$2,-*
20 *925,000.*

21 *Korea: Operational and training facilities, supply facili-*
22 *ties, and utilities, \$904,000.*

(United States Army, Europe)

France: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,063,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$63,906,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in

1 the total amount of \$25,000,000: Provided, That the Sec-
2 retary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Com-
3 mittees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of
4 Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision
5 to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work
6 undertaken under this section, including those real estate
7 actions pertaining thereto.

8 SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of
9 section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119,
10 1125), as amended, and subject to the provisions of section
11 513 of this Act, the Secretary of the Army is authorized
12 to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing
13 for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations
14 by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the
15 provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and
16 Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other
17 commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corpora-
18 tion:

19 Various locations, France, 298 units.

20 Vicenza, Italy, 371 units.

21 Army Security Agency, location 13, 91 units.

22 Gateway Communications Station, 174 units.

23 (b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the
24 Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended,
25 the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family

1 housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following
2 locations:

3 *INSIDE THE UNITED STATES*

- 4 *Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, 316 units.*
5 *Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York, 120 units.*
6 *White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, 200 units.*
7 *Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, 130 units.*
8 *Fort Lee, Virginia, 435 units.*
9 *Natick R&E, Massachusetts, 35 units.*
10 *Fort Belvoir, Virginia, 618 units.*
11 *Two Rock Ranch Station, California, 25 units.*
12 *Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 50 units.*
13 *Beaumont Army Hospital, Texas, 125 units.*
14 *Fort Totten, New York, 130 units.*
15 *Fort Campbell, Kentucky, 837 units.*
16 *Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois, 65 units.*
17 *Fort Rucker, Alabama, 400 units.*
18 *Fort Stewart, Georgia, 73 units.*
19 *Fort Bliss, Texas, 410 units.*
20 *Fort Hood, Texas, 500 units.*
21 *Fort Sill, Oklahoma, 349 units.*
22 *Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 700 units.*
23 *Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, 200 units.*
24 *Fort Sheridan, Illinois, 50 units.*
25 *Forts Baker and Barry, California, 98 units.*

1 *Oakland Army Terminal, California, 88 units.*

2 *Fort Lewis, Washington, 856 units.*

3 *Branch United States Disciplinary Barracks, California,*
4 *160 units.*

5 *United States Military Academy, New York, 156 units.*

6 *Bossier Base, Louisiana, 200 units.*

7 *Medina Base, Texas, 125 units.*

8 *Sandia Base, New Mexico, 213 units.*

9 *Army Air Defense Command Stations, 466 units.*

10 *OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES*

11 *Canal Zone, 330 units.*

12 *Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, 385 units.*

13 *Fort Shafter, Hawaii, 481 units: Provided, however,*
14 *That no family housing units shall be constructed on Fort*
15 *DeRussy.*

16 *(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404*
17 *(a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as*
18 *amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to acquire*
19 *family housing at the following locations:*

20 *Aberdeen Proving Ground, Aberdeen, Maryland, 796*
21 *units.*

22 *Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 400 units.*

23 *Fort Sam Houston, Texas, 840 units.*

1 *Fort Sill, Oklahoma, 500 units.*

2 *SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress,*
 3 *as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL*
 4 *UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:*

5 *Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICE FACILI-*
 6 *TIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Pueblo Ordnance*
 7 *Depot, Colorado, strike out "\$563,000" and insert in place*
 8 *thereof "\$600,000".*

9 *(b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as*
 10 *amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-*
 11 *tion 502 the amounts "\$44,407,000" and "\$134,075,000"*
 12 *and inserting in place thereof "\$44,444,000" and "\$134,-*
 13 *112,000", respectively.*

14 *SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-*
 15 *gress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTI-*
 16 *NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:*

17 *(1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-*
 18 *CILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Redstone*
 19 *Arsenal, Alabama, strike out "\$2,865,000" and insert in*
 20 *place thereof "\$4,180,000".*

21 *(2) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-*
 22 *CILITIES (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Monmouth,*

1 *New Jersey, strike out “\$615,000” and insert in place*
2 *thereof “\$731,000”; and with respect to Vint Hill Farms*
3 *Station, Virginia, strike out “\$695,000” and insert in place*
4 *thereof “\$1,022,000”.*

5 (3) *Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-*
6 *CILITIES (Corps of Engineers)”, with respect to Granite*
7 *City Engineer Depot, Illinois, strike out “\$1,822,000” and*
8 *insert in place thereof “\$2,815,000”.*

9 (4) *Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FA-*
10 *CILITIES (Medical Corps)”, with respect to Walter Reed*
11 *Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, strike out “\$4,-*
12 *472,000” and insert in place thereof “\$6,714,000”.*

13 (5) *Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES*
14 *(Second Army Area)”, with respect to Fort George G.*
15 *Meade, Maryland, strike out “\$923,000” and insert in place*
16 *thereof “\$1,264,000”.*

17 (6) *Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES*
18 *(Fourth Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas,*
19 *strike out “\$4,645,000” and insert in place thereof “\$4,-*
20 *965,000”; and with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike*
21 *out “\$3,053,000” and insert in place thereof “\$3,454,000”.*

22 (7) *Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES*

1 *(Sixth Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Ord, California,*
 2 *strike out “\$1,407,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,-*
 3 *742,000”.*

4 *(8) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES*
 5 *(Military Academy)”, with respect to the United States*
 6 *Military Academy, New York, strike out “\$756,000” and*
 7 *insert in place thereof “\$1,171,000”.*

8 *(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as*
 9 *amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-*
 10 *tion 502 the amounts “\$237,320,000” and “\$546,387,000”*
 11 *and inserting in place thereof “\$244,125,000” and “\$553,-*
 12 *192,000”, respectively.*

13 *SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,*
 14 *as amended, is amended under the heading “INSIDE THE*
 15 *UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:*

16 *(1) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES*
 17 *FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)”, with respect to White*
 18 *Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico, strike out “\$693,000”*
 19 *and insert in place thereof “\$735,000”.*

20 *(2) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES*
 21 *FACILITIES (Chemical Corps)”, with respect to Camp*
 22 *Detrick, Maryland, strike out “\$913,000” and insert in place*

1 thereof “\$1,074,000”; and with respect to Dugway Proving
 2 Ground, Utah, strike out “\$867,000” and insert in place
 3 thereof “\$1,044,000”.

4 (3) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
 5 FACILITIES (Signal Corps)”, with respect to Fort Hua-
 6 chuca, Arizona, strike out “\$6,856,000” and insert in place
 7 thereof “\$7,576,000”.

8 (4) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
 9 FACILITIES (Corps of Engineers)”, with respect to Fort
 10 Belvoir, Virginia, strike out “\$492,000” and insert in place
 11 thereof “\$940,000”.

12 (5) Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES
 13 FACILITIES (Transportation Corps)”, with respect to Fort
 14 Eustis, Virginia, strike out “\$1,231,000” and insert in place
 15 thereof “\$1,436,000”.

16 (6) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
 17 (First Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Dix, New Jersey,
 18 strike out “\$54,000” and insert in place thereof “\$68,000”.

19 (7) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
 20 (Second Army Area)”, with respect to Fort George G.
 21 Meade, Maryland, strike out “\$5,885,000” and insert in
 22 place thereof “\$7,695,000”.

23 (8) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
 24 (Third Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Benning,
 25 Georgia, strike out “\$422,000” and insert in place thereof

1 “\$616,000”; and with respect to Fort McClellan, Alabama,
 2 strike out “\$397,000” and insert in place thereof
 3 “\$527,000”.

4 (9) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
 5 (Fourth Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Hood, Texas,
 6 strike out “\$2,457,000” and insert in place thereof
 7 “\$2,846,000”.

8 (10) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILI-
 9 TIES (Fifth Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Riley,
 10 Kansas, strike out “\$1,519,000” and insert in place thereof
 11 “\$1,892,000”.

12 (11) Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILI-
 13 TIES (Sixth Army Area)”, with respect to Fort Lewis,
 14 Washington, strike out “\$3,022,000” and insert in place
 15 thereof “\$3,596,000”; and with respect to Fort Ord, Cali-
 16 fornia, strike out “\$223,000” and insert in place thereof
 17 “\$319,000”.

18 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 19 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE THE
 20 UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

21 Under the subheading “(Alaskan Area)”, with re-
 22 spect to Wildwood Station (Kenai), strike out “\$352,000”
 23 and insert in place thereof “\$516,000”.

24 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as

1 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
2 tion 402 the amounts “\$95,010,000”, “\$35,763,000”, and
3 “\$334,104,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$100,-
4 343,000”, “\$35,927,000”, and “\$339,601,000”, respec-
5 tively.

6 SEC. 108. (a) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Con-
7 gress, is amended under the heading “INSIDE THE UNITED
8 STATES” in section 101 as follows:

9 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
10 TIES (Corps of Engineers)” with respect to Cold Regions
11 Laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire, strike out “\$2,496,-
12 000” and insert in place thereof “\$3,787,000”.

13 (b) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is
14 amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the
15 amounts “\$115,624,000” and “\$293,103,000” and insert-
16 ing in place thereof “\$116,915,000” and “\$294,394,000”.

17 SEC. 110. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized
18 and directed, unless the Secretary of Defense finds after due
19 investigation that such action would be inimical to the national
20 security, to make available to the Administrator of the
21 General Services Administration, or his designee, the San
22 Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Texas. Upon such property being
23 made available, the Administrator or his designee is author-

1 *ized and directed to enter into a contract or contracts for*
2 *the sale of such property in lots or in its entirety under public*
3 *bid procedures and at not less than the fair market value*
4 *and to convey by quitclaim deed, all right, title, and interest*
5 *of the United States, except as retained in this Act, in and*
6 *to such property to any legal person or group except Gov-*
7 *ernment agencies or departments upon such terms and condi-*
8 *tions as the Administrator or his designee determines to be in*
9 *the public interest.*

10 *(b) Any conveyance made pursuant to the provisions of*
11 *subsection (a) hereof shall include the following conditions:*

12 *(1) All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the*
13 *lands to be conveyed shall be reserved to the United*
14 *States;*

15 *(2) The San Jacinto property shall be offered for*
16 *sale within thirty-six months from the date of enactment*
17 *of this Act;*

18 *(3) Title in and to such property shall remain in*
19 *the United States until full payment of the agreed pur-*
20 *chase price is made.*

21 *(c) In the event the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot is*
22 *made available to the General Services Administration pur-*
23 *suant to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) hereof,*

1 *there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary*
2 *of the Army such sums as are necessary not to exceed*
3 *\$40,000,000 to establish and construct, including land acqui-*
4 *sition, replacement facilities to the extent required at Point-*
5 *Aux-Pins, Alabama, or any other location selected by the*
6 *Secretary of Defense.*

7 *TITLE II*

8 *SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or*
9 *develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, con-*
10 *structing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent*
11 *or temporary public works, including site preparation,*
12 *appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following*
13 *projects:*

14 *INSIDE THE UNITED STATES*

15 *SHIPYARD FACILITIES*

16 *Naval Facility, Cape May, New Jersey: Operational*
17 *and training facilities, \$141,000.*

18 *Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Operational*
19 *and training facilities, \$6,000,000: Provided, however, That*
20 *no more than \$500,000 of this sum shall be utilized for*
21 *protective works until the Secretary of the Navy determines*
22 *in his judgment that sufficient action has been taken or*
23 *arrangements made to arrest further subsidence of the ship-*
24 *yard.*

1 *Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut:*
2 *Operational and training facilities, \$2,247,000.*

3 *Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California: Opera-*
4 *tional and training facilities, \$766,000.*

5 *FLEET BASE FACILITIES*

6 *Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing,*
7 *and community facilities, \$1,709,000.*

8 *Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational and train-*
9 *ing facilities, \$2,546,000.*

10 *AVIATION FACILITIES*

11 *(Naval Air Training Stations)*

12 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Troop*
13 *housing, \$1,041,000.*

14 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi:*
15 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
16 *supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, commu-*
17 *nity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,*
18 *\$14,940,000.*

19 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida:*
20 *Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground im-*
21 *provements, and real estate, \$4,679,000.*

22 *(Fleet Support Air Stations)*

23 *Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational and*
24 *training facilities, \$114,000.*

1 *Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Maintenance*
2 *facilities, \$1,252,000.*

3 *Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Cali-*
4 *fornia: Operational and training facilities, \$47,000.*

5 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Opera-*
6 *tional and training facilities, \$80,000.*

7 *Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Fentress, Virginia:*
8 *Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.*

9 *Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina:*
10 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
11 *medical facilities, troop housing, administrative facilities, and*
12 *utilities and ground improvements, \$11,215,000.*

13 *Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational*
14 *and training facilities, \$74,000.*

15 *Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and*
16 *training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, admin-*
17 *istrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground*
18 *improvements, \$15,823,000.*

19 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Opera-*
20 *tional and training facilities, supply facilities, community fa-*
21 *cilities, utilities, and real estate, \$9,892,000.*

22 *Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California:*
23 *Operational facilities, and real estate, \$7,000,000.*

24 *Naval Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field, Florida:*
25 *Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.*

(*Marine Corps Air Stations*)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities and real estate, \$4,352,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, \$8,946,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,067,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, \$1,003,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Operational and training facilities, \$2,158,000.

(*Special Purpose Air Stations*)

Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, utilities, and operational and training facilities at the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland, \$17,666,000.

Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities,

1 *and troop housing (including operational and training facili-*
 2 *ties and troop housing on San Nicolas Island; and mainte-*
 3 *nance facilities, research, development and test facilities,*
 4 *supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground*
 5 *improvements at Camp Cooke), \$13,841,000.*

6 *SUPPLY FACILITIES*

7 *Naval Supply Depot, Newport, Rhode Island: Utilities,*
 8 *\$2,210,000.*

9 *Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Administrative*
 10 *facilities, \$128,000.*

11 *Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California: Administra-*
 12 *tive facilities, \$146,000.*

13 *MARINE CORPS FACILITIES*

14 *Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California:*
 15 *Operational and training facilities, \$280,000.*

16 *Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South*
 17 *Carolina: Utilities, \$462,000.*

18 *Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Oper-*
 19 *ational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop*
 20 *housing, and utilities, \$5,138,000.*

21 *Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Operational*
 22 *and training facilities, \$168,000.*

23 *Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California:*
 24 *Utilities, \$206,000.*

1 *Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California:*
2 *Maintenance facilities, \$241,000.*

3 ORDNANCE FACILITIES

4 *Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Main-*
5 *tenance facilities, \$86,000.*

6 *Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California:*
7 *Supply facilities, \$129,000.*

8 *Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord, California: Main-*
9 *tenance facilities, \$2,517,000.*

10 *Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, California: Re-*
11 *search, development, and test facilities, \$510,000.*

12 *Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Virginia: Research,*
13 *development, and test facilities, \$44,000.*

14 *Naval Ammunition Depot, Hingham, Massachusetts:*
15 *Maintenance facilities, \$694,000.*

16 *Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland:*
17 *Research, development, and test facilities, \$601,000.*

18 SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

19 *Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Troop housing.*
20 *\$14,200,000.*

21 *Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Vir-*
22 *ginia: Operational and training facilities, \$1,184,000.*

23 *Naval Receiving Station, District of Columbia: Opera-*
24 *tional facilities, \$650,000,*

1 *Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Opera-*
2 *tional and training facilities, \$1,368,000.*

3 *Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island: Opera-*
4 *tional and training facilities, \$273,000.*

5 *Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia: Opera-*
6 *tional and training facilities, \$4,643,000.*

7 *Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Opera-*
8 *tional and training facilities, \$4,199,000.*

9 MEDICAL FACILITIES

10 *National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland:*
11 *Hospital and medical facilities, \$8,503,000.*

12 *COMMUNICATION FACILITIES*

13 *Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Oper-*
14 *ational and training facilities, and utilities and ground im-*
15 *provements, \$38,654,000.*

16 *OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES*

17 *Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Re-*
18 *search, development, and test facilities, \$192,000.*

19 *OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES*

20 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

21 *Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory*
22 *of Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, \$159,000.*

23 *AVIATION FACILITIES*

24 Naval Air Station, Agana, Mariana Islands: Opera-
25 tional and training facilities, and real estate, \$4,414,000.

1 *Naval Station, Bermuda, British West Indies: Opera-*
2 *tional and training facilities, \$683,000.*

3 *Naval Air Station, Ford Island, Territory of Hawaii:*
4 *Operational and training facilities, \$1,271,000.*

5 *Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Supply facilities,*
6 *\$165,000.*

7 *Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Opera-*
8 *tional and training facilities, \$3,824,000.*

9 SUPPLY FACILITIES

10 *Naval Supply Depot, Guam, Mariana Islands: Supply*
11 *facilities, \$3,060,000.*

12 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

13 *Naval Communication Unit Number Three, Asmara,*
14 *Eritrea: Operational and training facilities, \$1,180,000.*

15 *Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland:*
16 *Operational and training facilities, \$219,000.*

17 *Naval Radio Facility, Port Lyautey, Morocco: Opera-*
18 *tional and training facilities, \$519,000.*

19 YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

20 *Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba:*
21 *Utilities, \$890,000.*

22 *SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish*
23 *or develop classified naval installations and facilities by*
24 *acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or in-*
25 *stalling permanent or temporary public works, including*

1 land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities,
2 and equipment in the total amount of \$66,194,000.

3 *SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or*
4 *develop naval installations and facilities by proceeding with*
5 *construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions,*
6 *new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research*
7 *and development requirements, or improved production*
8 *schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that de-*
9 *ferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military*
10 *construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with*
11 *interests of national security, and in connection therewith to*
12 *acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent*
13 *or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site*
14 *preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the*
15 *total amount of \$25,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary*
16 *of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on*
17 *Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives*
18 *immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of*
19 *the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under*
20 *this section, including those real estate actions pertaining*
21 *thereto.*

22 *SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of*
23 *section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119,*
24 *1125), as amended, and subject to the provisions of section*
25 *513 of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized*

1 to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing
2 for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities
3 at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies
4 acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade
5 Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454)
6 or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity
7 Credit Corporation:

8 *Naval Magazine, Cartagena, Spain, 46 units, and com-*
9 *munity facilities.*

10 *Naval Magazine, El Ferrol, Spain, 45 units, and com-*
11 *munity facilities.*

12 *Naval Air Station, Port Lyautey, Morocco, 330 units.*

13 *Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Italy, 122 units, and*
14 *community facilities.*

15 *(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the*
16 *Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended,*
17 *the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family*
18 *housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following*
19 *locations:*

20 *INSIDE THE UNITED STATES*

21 *Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, 277 units.*

22 *Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina,*
23 *800 units.*

24 *Naval Facility, Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, 27*
25 *units.*

- 1 *Naval Facility, Centerville, California, 24 units.*
- 2 *Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Caro-*
- 3 *lina, 849 units.*
- 4 *Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oregon, 24 units.*
- 5 *Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, 425 units.*
- 6 *Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 800 units.*
- 7 *Naval Facility, Nantucket, Massachusetts, 19 units.*
- 8 *Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500*
- 9 *units.*
- 10 *Naval Facility, Pacific Beach, Washington, 30 units.*
- 11 *Naval Facility, Point Sur, California, 24 units.*
- 12 *Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, 550*
- 13 *units.*
- 14 *Naval Ordnance Missile Test Facility, White Sands*
- 15 *Proving Grounds, New Mexico, 51 units.*

OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES

- 17 *Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of*
- 18 *Hawaii, 1,140 units.*
- 19 *Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, Headquarters, Camp H. M.*
- 20 *Smith, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 168 units.*
- 21 *Naval Station, Guam, Mariana, Islands, 220 units.*
- 22 *Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Terri-*
- 23 *tory of Hawaii, 650 units.*
- 24 *Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii,*
- 25 *80 units.*

1 *Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Ha-*
2 *waii, 650 units.*

3 *(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404*
4 *(a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as*
5 *amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to acquire*
6 *family housing at the following locations:*

7 *Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, 1,562*
8 *units.*

9 *Marine Corps Training Center, Twenty-nine Palms,*
10 *California, 493 units.*

11 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida,*
12 *96 units.*

13 *Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Maryland, 385*
14 *units.*

15 *Naval Station, Green Cove Springs, Florida, 392 units.*

16 *Squantum Gardens, Massachusetts, 150 units.*

17 *SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Con-*
18 *gress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTI-*
19 *NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:*

20 *Under the subheading "MEDICAL FACILITIES", with re-*
21 *spect to the Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Virginia Area, strike*
22 *out "\$12,815,000" and insert in place thereof "\$13,979,-*
23 *000".*

24 *(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as*
25 *amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section*

1 402 the amounts “\$139,143,000” and “\$266,927,000”, and
 2 inserting respectively in place thereof “\$140,307,000”, and
 3 “\$268,091,000”.

4 SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
 5 as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202,
 6 “\$70,656,000”, and inserting in place thereof “\$72,785,-
 7 000”.

8 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
 9 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section
 10 502 the amounts “\$70,656,000”, and “\$210,704,000” and
 11 inserting respectively in place thereof “\$72,785,000”, and
 12 “\$212,833,000”.

13 SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
 14 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
 15 UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:

16 (1) Under the subheading “MARINE CORPS FACIL-
 17 ITIES”, with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pen-
 18 dleton, California, strike out “\$648,000” and insert in place
 19 thereof \$778,000”.

20 (2) Under the subheading “ORDNANCE FACILITIES”,
 21 with respect to the Naval Underwater Ordnance Station,
 22 Newport, Rhode Island, strike out “\$370,000” and insert
 23 in place thereof “\$411,000”.

24 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as

1 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CONTI-
2 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 201, as follows:

3 Under subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES”, with re-
4 spect to the Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Is-
5 lands, by striking out “\$6,525,000” and inserting in place
6 thereof “\$9,063,000” and with respect to the Naval Station,
7 Argentia, Newfoundland, by striking out “\$8,589,800” and
8 inserting in place thereof “\$9,089,800”.

9 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
10 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
11 tion 502 the amounts “\$308,463,600”, “\$108,365,300”, and
12 “\$575,592,300” and inserting respectively in place thereof
13 “\$308,634,600”, “\$111,403,300”, and “\$578,801,300”.

14 SEC. 208. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Con-
15 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading “INSIDE
16 THE UNITED STATES” in section 201, as follows:

17 (1) Under the subheading “FLEET BASE FACILITIES”,
18 with respect to the Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island,
19 strike out “\$11,672,000” and insert in place thereof
20 “\$14,601,000”.

21 (2) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
22 (Naval Air Training Stations)”, with respect to the Naval
23 Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas, strike out

1 “\$2,247,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,569,000”;
 2 and with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Merid-
 3 ian, Mississippi, strike out “\$8,231,000” and insert in place
 4 thereof “\$9,141,000”.

5 (3) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
 6 (Marine Corps Air Stations)”, with respect to the Marine
 7 Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, strike out
 8 “\$170,000” and insert in place thereof “\$273,000”.

9 (4) Under the subheading “SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
 10 TIES”, with respect to the Fleet Air Defense Training
 11 Center, Dam Neck, Virginia, strike out “\$237,000” and
 12 insert in place thereof “\$300,000”, and with respect to the
 13 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, strike out
 14 “\$8,413,000” and insert in place thereof “\$10,613,000”.

15 (5) Under the subheading “MEDICAL FACILITIES”,
 16 with respect to the Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Illinois,
 17 strike out “\$12,730,000” and insert in place thereof
 18 “\$14,754,000”.

19 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 20 amended, is amended by striking out in section 203
 21 “\$85,939,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$86,711,000”.

22 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 23 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
 24 tion 402 the amounts “\$303,453,000”, “\$85,939,000”, and

1 “\$451,393,000” and inserting respectively in place thereof
2 “\$312,004,000”, “\$86,711,000”, and “\$460,716,000”.

3 SEC. 209. Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress,
4 is amended under the heading “INSIDE THE UNITED
5 STATES” in section 201 as follows:

6 Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES (Special
7 Purpose Air Stations)”, with respect to the Naval Air
8 Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, insert before
9 “\$7,669,000” the words “and land acquisition,”.

10 TITLE III

11 SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish
12 or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring,
13 constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing per-
14 manent or temporary public works, including site prepa-
15 ration, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the
16 following projects:

17 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

18 AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

19 Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Main-
20 tenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate,
21 \$2,649,000.

22 Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont:
23 Troop housing, \$990,000.

24 Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
2 facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, utilities, and
3 real estate, \$10,659,000.

4 *Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North*
5 *Dakota: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital*
6 *facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities,*
7 *\$4,176,000.*

8 *K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan:*
9 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
10 *supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities,*
11 *troop housing, and utilities, \$10,673,000.*

12 *Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Community*
13 *facilities, and utilities, \$229,000.*

14 *Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan:*
15 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
16 *supply facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, \$9,948,000.*

17 *McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington:*
18 *Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$935,000.*

19 *Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Main-*
20 *tenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities,*
21 *troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,721,000.*

22 *Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Opera-*
23 *tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop*
24 *housing and utilities, \$3,689,000.*

1 *Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Medical*
 2 *facilities, \$122,000.*

3 *Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri:*
 4 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
 5 *supply facilities, administrative facilities, and real estate,*
 6 *\$2,799,000.*

7 *Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan:*
 8 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and*
 9 *utilities and ground improvements, \$3,579,000.*

10 *Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach,*
 11 *New York: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.*

12 *Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Troop housing, and*
 13 *ground improvements, \$795,000.*

14 *Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Opera-*
 15 *tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and*
 16 *utilities, \$3,992,000.*

17 *Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Opera-*
 18 *tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply*
 19 *facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, and utilities,*
 20 *\$8,696,000.*

21 *AIR MATERIEL COMMAND*

22 *Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Mainte-*
 23 *nance facilities, and supply facilities, \$975,000.*

24 *Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational*

1 and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate,
2 \$1,177,000.

3 Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and
4 training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing,
5 \$1,746,000.

6 Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Utilities,
7 \$157,000.

8 Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania:
9 Supply facilities, \$94,000.

10 McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California:
11 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
12 supply facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing,
13 \$1,560,000.

14 Memphis General Depot, Memphis, Tennessee: Admin-
15 istrative facilities, \$1,464,000.

16 Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California:
17 Supply facilities, \$658,000.

18 Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania:
19 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
20 medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing,
21 community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$6,169,000.

22 Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational

1 *and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facil-*
2 *ities, and utilities, \$4,362,000.*

3 *Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma:*
4 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
5 *troop housing, and community facilities, \$5,196,000.*

6 *Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Oper-*
7 *ational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, re-*
8 *search, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and*
9 *medical facilities, \$11,037,000.*

10 *AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND*

11 *Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California; Research,*
12 *development, and test facilities, and utilities, \$981,000.*

13 *Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Opera-*
14 *tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research,*
15 *development, and test facilities, supply facilities, utilities,*
16 *and real estate, \$10,109,000.*

17 *Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico:*
18 *Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utili-*
19 *ties, and real estate, \$1,650,000.*

20 *Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:*
21 *Supply facilities, and utilities, \$481,000.*

1 *Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts:*
2 *Maintenance facilities, \$165,000.*

3 *Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational*
4 *and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing,*
5 *and community facilities, \$2,884,000.*

6 *SCHOOL OF AVIATION MEDICINE*

7 *School of Aviation Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base,*
8 *San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, re-*
9 *search, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, hos-*
10 *pital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop*
11 *housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improve-*
12 *ments, \$12,000,000.*

13 *AIR TRAINING COMMAND*

14 *Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational*
15 *and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities,*
16 *\$979,000.*

17 *Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational*
18 *and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-*
19 *ties, utilities, and real estate, \$1,584,000.*

20 *Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Troop hous-*
21 *ing, \$640,000.*

1 *Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Troop hous-*
2 *ing, \$400,000.*

3 *Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi:*
4 *Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$208,000.*

5 *James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Troop*
6 *housing, \$750,000.*

7 *Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance*
8 *facilities, and utilities, \$441,000.*

9 *Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Oper-*
10 *ational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,*
11 *\$1,213,000.*

12 *McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Opera-*
13 *tional and training facilities, \$2,119,000.*

14 *Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational*
15 *and training facilities, \$5,432,000.*

16 *Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Mainte-*
17 *nance facilities, \$358,000.*

18 *Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance*
19 *facilities, \$319,000.*

20 *Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Opera-*
21 *tional and training facilities, and utilities, \$245,000.*

1 *Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Oper-*
2 *ational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop*
3 *housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,051,000.*

4 *Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Supply facilities,*
5 *administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$571,000.*

6 *Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational*
7 *and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,770,000.*

8 Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational
9 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and
10 ground improvements, and real estate, \$3,081,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,361,000.

14 CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

15 *Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Troop*
16 *housing, \$1,805,000.*

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio:
Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
supply facilities, and administrative facilities, troop housing,
community facilities, and utilities, \$11,589,000.

21 *Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Utilities,*
22 *\$172,000.*

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

*Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland:
Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$18,-
937,000.*

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

*Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina:
Maintenance facilities, \$78,000.*

*Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational
and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities,
\$2,874,000.*

*McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey:
Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
troop housing, and utilities, \$3,901,000.*

*Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Troop hous-
ing, \$423,000.*

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

*Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational
and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real
estate, \$4,051,000.*

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana:

1 *Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utili-*
2 *ties, \$3,355,000.*

3 *Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Opera-*
4 *tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply*
5 *facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, com-*
6 *munity facilities, and utilities, \$7,868,000.*

7 *Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational*
8 *and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and*
9 *utilities, \$5,080,000.*

10 *Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas:*
11 *Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,654,000.*

12 *Brunswick Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Op-*
13 *erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply*
14 *facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community*
15 *facilities, and utilities, \$11,417,000.*

16 *Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Opera-*
17 *tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop*
18 *housing, and utilities, \$7,996,000.*

19 *Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Opera-*
20 *tional and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$2,257,-*
21 *000.*

22 *Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Operational*
23 *and training facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate,*
24 *\$4,183,000.*

25 *Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma:*

1 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
2 *supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,-*
3 *734,000.*

4 *Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Oper-*
5 *ational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,*
6 *\$1,939,000.*

7 *Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona:*
8 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
9 *supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,174,000.*

10 *Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and*
11 *training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,*
12 *troop housing, and utilities, \$2,404,000.*

13 *Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational*
14 *and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,346,000.*

15 *Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota:*
16 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
17 *community facilities, and utilities, \$2,931,000.*

18 *Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington:*
19 *Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$4,094,000.*

20 *Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational*
21 *and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,*
22 *and utilities, \$2,703,000.*

23 *Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Opera-*
24 *tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities*
25 *and ground improvements, \$1,489,000.*

1 *Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Opera-*
2 *tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,*
3 *\$4,493,000.*

4 *Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana:*
5 *Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,*
6 *\$3,401,000.*

7 *Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington:*
8 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
9 *supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,795,000.*

10 *Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational*
11 *and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community*
12 *facilities, \$897,000.*

13 *Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Operational*
14 *and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-*
15 *ties, and utilities, \$4,250,000.*

16 *Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas:*
17 *Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utili-*
18 *ties, \$3,463,000.*

19 *Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Opera-*
20 *tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate,*
21 *\$11,716,000.*

22 *Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational*
23 *and training facilities, and utilities, \$3,774,000.*

24 *MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational*
25 *and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,*
26 *\$3,577,000.*

1 *Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Op-*
2 *erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply*
3 *facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,832,000.*

4 *March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Opera-*
5 *tional and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and*
6 *real estate, \$3,344,000.*

7 *McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational*
8 *and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real*
9 *estate, \$5,137,000.*

10 *Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home,*
11 *Idaho: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities,*
12 *and community facilities, \$1,039,000.*

13 *Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational*
14 *and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate,*
15 *\$3,265,000.*

16 *Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire:*
17 *Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,*
18 *\$940,000.*

19 *Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York:*
20 *Supply facilities, and utilities, \$208,000.*

21 *Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin:*
22 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
23 *supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and com-*
24 *munity facilities, \$15,552,000.*

25 *Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational*

1 *and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,-*
2 *352,000.*

3 *Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Opera-*
4 *tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities,*
5 *\$2,997,000.*

6 *Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Opera-*
7 *tional and training facilities, supply facilities, community*
8 *facilities, and utilities, \$8,431,000.*

9 *Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachu-*
10 *setts: Troop housing, \$945,000.*

11 *Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri: Op-*
12 *erational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities,*
13 *and real estate, \$5,185,000.*

14 *TACTICAL AIR COMMAND*

15 *George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Main-*
16 *tenance facilities, \$536,000.*

17 *Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Mainte-*
18 *nance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,371,000.*

19 *Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South*
20 *Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance fa-*
21 *cilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,650,000.*

22 *Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Troop*
23 *housing, \$591,000.*

1 *Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North*
 2 *Carolina: Operational and training facilities, supply facili-*
 3 *ties, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,707,000.*

4 *Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Opera-*
 5 *tional and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,-*
 6 *339,000.*

7 *Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational*
 8 *and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-*
 9 *ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real*
 10 *estate, \$5,474,000.*

11 *SPECIAL FACILITIES*

12 *Various locations: Operational and training facilities,*
 13 *\$563,000.*

14 *AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM*

15 *Various locations: Operational and training facilities,*
 16 *maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities,*
 17 *administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, com-*
 18 *munity facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$169,833,000.*

19 *OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES*

20 *AIR MATERIEL COMMAND*

21 *Various locations: Supply facilities, and utilities,*
 22 *\$696,000.*

1 ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

2 *Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training*
3 *facilities, \$380,000.*

4 *Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training*
5 *facilities, \$710,000.*

6 *King Salmon Airport: Operational and training facili-*
7 *ties, \$340,000.*

8 *Various locations: Operational and training facilities,*
9 *maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities,*
10 *administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities,*
11 *utilities and ground improvements, and real estate,*
12 *\$24,986,000.*

13 CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

14 *Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and*
15 *training facilities, \$1,540,000.*

16 MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

17 *Various locations: Maintenance facilities, supply facili-*
18 *ties, community facilities, and utilities, \$5,347,000.*

19 PACIFIC AIR FORCES

20 *Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Opera-*
21 *tional and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$144,000.*

22 *Midway Island: Supply facilities, \$839,000.*

23 *Various locations: Operational and training facilities,*
24 *maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-*
25 *munity facilities, and utilities, \$15,688,000.*

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,508,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$643,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$21,431,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$19,952,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$29,135,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$315,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for

1 ballistic and strategic missiles by acquiring, constructing,
2 converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or tem-
3 porary public works, including land acquisition, site prepara-
4 tion, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total
5 amount of \$195,500,000.

6 SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish
7 or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceed-
8 ing with construction made necessary by changes in Air
9 Force missions, new weapons developments, new and un-
10 foreseen research and development requirements, or im-
11 proved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense
12 determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in
13 the next military construction authorization Act would be
14 inconsistent with interests of national security, and in con-
15 nection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate,
16 or install permanent or temporary public works, including
17 land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities,
18 and equipment, in the total amount of \$25,000,000: Pro-
19 vided, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee,
20 shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate
21 and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching
22 a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of
23 any public work undertaken under this section, including
24 those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

1 *SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of*
2 *section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119,*
3 *1125), as amended, and subject to the provisions of section*
4 *513 of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force is author-*
5 *ized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family*
6 *housing for occupancy as public quarters and community*
7 *facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign cur-*
8 *rencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricul-*
9 *tural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68*
10 *Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the*
11 *Commodity Credit Corporation:*

12 *Lajes Field, Azores, 306 units.*

13 *Kindley Air Force Base, Bermuda, 300 units.*

14 *Laon, France, 102 units.*

15 *Keflavik Airport, Iceland, 300 units.*

16 *Benguerir Airport, Morocco, 248 units.*

17 *Sidi Slimane Air Base, Morocco, 295 units.*

18 *Clark Air Force Base, Philippines, 900 units.*

19 *Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, 200 units.*

20 *Madrid-Torrejon area, Spain, 460 units.*

21 *Moron-San Pablo area, Spain, 40 units.*

22 *Various locations, Spain, 120 units, and community*
23 *facilities.*

24 *Zaragoza Air Base, Spain, 176 units.*

25 *Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 50 units.*

1 *Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 190 units.*

2 *Bruntingthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 93*
3 *units.*

4 *Brize Norton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 215 units.*

5 *Chelveston RAF Station, United Kingdom, 79 units.*

6 *Chicksands Priory RAF Station, United Kingdom, 83*
7 *units.*

8 *Fairford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 177 units.*

9 *High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 110*
10 *units.*

11 *Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 55 units,*
12 *and community facilities.*

13 *Stansted-Mountfitchet RAF Station, United Kingdom,*
14 *22 units.*

15 *Upper Heyford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 259*
16 *units.*

17 *Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, 416 units.*

18 *(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of*
19 *the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as*
20 *amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to*
21 *construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters*
22 *at the following locations:*

23 *INSIDE THE UNITED STATES*

24 *Camp Adair Air Force Station, Oregon, 150 units.*

25 *Amarillo Air Force Base, Texas, 500 units.*

- 1 *Beale Air Force Base, California, 970 units.*
- 2 *Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 250 units.*
- 3 *Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, 450 units.*
- 4 *Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 536 units.*
- 5 *Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 50 units.*
- 6 *Custer Air Force Station, Michigan, 169 units.*
- 7 *Donaldson Air Force Base, South Carolina, 275 units.*
- 8 *Cooke Air Force Base, California, 525 units.*
- 9 *Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 500 units.*
- 10 *Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 530 units.*
- 11 *Duluth Municipal Airport, Minnesota, 365 units.*
- 12 *Edwards Air Force Base, California, 778 units.*
- 13 *Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 220 units.*
- 14 *Forbes Air Force Base, Kansas, 414 units.*
- 15 *Fort Lee Air Force Station, Virginia, 154 units.*
- 16 *Geiger Field, Washington, 168 units.*
- 17 *Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 460 units.*
- 18 *Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 744 units.*
- 19 *Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, 270 units.*
- 20 *Hamilton Air Force Base, California, 550 units.*
- 21 *Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, 400 units.*
- 22 *James Connally Air Force Base, Texas, 366 units.*
- 23 *Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 290 units.*
- 24 *Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 475 units.*
- 25 *K. I. Sawyer Airport, Michigan, 595 units.*

- 1 *Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, 490 units.*
- 2 *Lakes Charles Air Force Base, Louisiana, 300 units.*
- 3 *Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, 500 units.*
- 4 *Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 200 units.*
- 5 *Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio, 400 units.*
- 6 *Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 150 units.*
- 7 *Mather Air Force Base, California, 220 units.*
- 8 *McChord Air Force Base, Washington, 1,000 units.*
- 9 *McClellan Air Force Base, California, 540 units.*
- 10 *McCoy Air Force Base, Florida, 668 units.*
- 11 *McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, 1,450 units.*
- 12 *Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 932 units.*
- 13 *Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 270 units.*
- 14 *Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, 200 units.*
- 15 *Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, New York, 290 units.*
- 16 *Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 616 units.*
- 17 *Oxnard Air Force Base, California, 315 units.*
- 18 *Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, 483 units.*
- 19 *Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.*
- 20 *Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wisconsin, 900 units.*
- 21 *Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Missouri, 610 units.*
- 22 *Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, 150 units.*
- 23 *Selfridge Air Force Base, Michigan, 580 units.*
- 24 *Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas, 500 units.*
- 25 *Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa, 235 units.*

- 1 *Stewart Air Force Base, New York, 300 units.*
- 2 *Suffolk County Air Force Base, New York, 220 units.*
- 3 *Syracuse Air Force Station, New York, 216 units.*
- 4 *Topsham Air Force Station, Maine, 177 units.*
- 5 *Truax Field, Wisconsin, 280 units.*
- 6 *Turner Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units.*
- 7 *United States Air Force Academy, Colorado, 300 units.*
- 8 *Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 230 units.*
- 9 *Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts, 310 units.*
- 10 *Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 154 units.*
- 11 *Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, 150 units.*
- 12 *Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 618 units.*

13 *OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES*

- 14 *Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, 1,050 units.*
- 15 *Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, 600 units.*
- 16 *(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404*
- 17 *(a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652),*
- 18 *as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized*
- 19 *to acquire family housing at the following locations:*
- 20 *Brookley Air Force Base, Alabama, 175 units.*
- 21 *Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, 600 units.*
- 22 *Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 225 units.*
- 23 *Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, 550 units.*
- 24 *Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, 500*
- 25 *units.*

1 *Hunter Air Force Base, Georgia, 500 units.*

2 *Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, 592 units.*

3 *Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, 480 units.*

4 *March Air Force Base, California, 644 units.*

5 *Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, 250 units.*

6 *Mitchel Air Force Base, New York, 628 units.*

7 *Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, 612 units.*

8 *Reese Air Force Base, Texas, 418 units.*

9 *Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, 400 units.*

10 *Walker Air Force Base, New Mexico, 800 units.*

11 *Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, 2,000 units.*

12 *SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-*
13 *gress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "CONTI-*
14 *NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301 as follows:*

15 *Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND", with*
16 *respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts,*
17 *strike out "\$6,076,000", and insert in place thereof*
18 *"\$6,522,000".*

19 *Under the subheading "AIR MATERIAL COMMAND",*
20 *with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton,*
21 *Ohio, strike out "\$14,508,000" and insert in place thereof*
22 *"\$15,800,000".*

23 *(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as*
24 *amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-*
25 *tion 502 the amounts "\$824,300,000" and "\$1,363,-*

1 189,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$826,038,000”
2 and “\$1,364,927,000”, respectively.

3 SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
4 as amended, is amended, under the heading “INSIDE THE
5 UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

6 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

7 (1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport,
8 Duluth, Minnesota, strike out “\$1,469,000” and insert
9 in place thereof “\$1,636,000”.

10 (2) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Fal-
11 mouth, Massachusetts, strike out “\$11,577,000” and
12 insert in place thereof “\$13,341,000”.

13 Under the subheading “AIR MATERIEL COMMAND”, with
14 respect to Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, strike out
15 “\$1,339,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,661,000”.

16 Under the subheading “AIR TRAINING COMMAND”, with
17 respect to James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas,
18 strike out “\$4,687,000” and insert in place thereof “\$5,-
19 301,000”.

20 Under the subheading “STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND”
21 with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls,
22 Montana, strike out “\$1,586,000” and insert in place thereof
23 “\$1,726,000”.

24 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
25 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section

1 402 the amounts “\$811,342,000” and “\$1,447,950,000”
2 and inserting in place thereof “\$814,349,000” and “\$1,450,-
3 957,000”, respectively.

4 SEC. 307. (a) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Con-
5 gress, is amended, under the heading “INSIDE THE UNITED
6 STATES” in section 301, as follows:

7 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

8 (1) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glas-
9 gow, Montana, strike out \$2,048,000” and insert in
10 place thereof “\$2,390,000”.

11 (2) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base,
12 Kansas City, Missouri, strike out “\$1,100,000” and in-
13 sert in place thereof “\$1,348,000”.

14 (3) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot,
15 North Dakota, strike out “\$6,804,000” and insert in
16 place thereof “\$8,507,000”.

17 (4) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth,
18 Massachusetts, strike out “\$559,000” and insert in place
19 thereof “\$615,000”.

20 Under the subheading “AIR MATERIEL COMMAND”,
21 with respect to Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas,
22 strike out “\$899,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,128,-
23 000”.

24 Under the subheading “AIR TRAINING COMMAND”, with

1 *respect to Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas, strike*
 2 *out “\$460,000” and insert in place thereof “\$637,000”.*

3 *Under the subheading “STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND”—*

4 *(1) with respect to Barksdale Air Force Base,*
 5 *Shreveport, Louisiana, strike out “\$3,344,000” and*
 6 *insert in place thereof “\$3,633,000”.*

7 *(2) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marys-*
 8 *ville, California, strike out “\$7,458,000” and insert in*
 9 *place thereof “\$9,087,000”.*

10 *(3) with respect to MacDill Air Force Base,*
 11 *Tampa, Florida, strike out “\$936,000” and insert in*
 12 *place thereof “\$1,268,000”.*

13 *(4) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base,*
 14 *Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out “\$2,344,000”*
 15 *and insert in place thereof “\$2,947,000”.*

16 *(5) with respect to Whiteman Air Force Base,*
 17 *Knob Noster, Missouri, strike out “\$235,000” and in-*
 18 *sert in place thereof “\$306,000”.*

19 *(b) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is*
 20 *amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the*
 21 *amounts “\$394,076,000” and “\$601,781,000” and inserting*
 22 *in place thereof “\$399,755,000” and “\$607,460,000”,*
 23 *respectively.*

24 *SEC. 308. (a) Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Con-*

gress, is amended, under the heading “ALERT AND DISPERSAL OF STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND FORCES” in section 1, as follows:

(1) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out “\$895,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,892,000”.

(2) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out “\$867,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,479,000”.

(3) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out “\$4,380,000” and insert in place thereof “\$5,479,000”.

(4) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out “\$690,000” and insert in place thereof “\$969,000”.

(b) Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended by striking out in section 3 the amount “\$549,670,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$552,657,000”.

SEC. 309. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure “\$135,425,000” and inserting in place thereof the figure “\$139,797,000”.

SEC. 310. The last paragraph under the heading “RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND” in title III of

1 *Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress (69 Stat. 342),*
2 *is amended to read as follows:*

3 *“Various Locations: Research, development, and opera-*
4 *tional facilities (including not more than \$357,000 for an*
5 *off-base roadway approximately ten miles in length in the*
6 *vicinity of the north boundary of Cape Canaveral—an aux-*
7 *iliary to Patrick Air Force Base) \$20,000,000.”*

8 *The amendment made by this section is effective from*
9 *March 1, 1956.*

10 *TITLE IV*

11 *SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or*
12 *develop installations and facilities required for advanced*
13 *research projects and in connection therewith may acquire,*
14 *construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or*
15 *temporary public works, including land acquisition, site*
16 *preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the*
17 *total amount of \$50,000,000.*

18 *SEC. 402. The Secretary of Defense or his designee may*
19 *establish or develop classified installations and facilities for*
20 *defense missiles by acquiring, constructing, converting, re-*
21 *habilitating or installing permanent or temporary works,*
22 *including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances,*
23 *utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$183,401,000.*

1 *SEC. 403. The Secretary of Defense shall report in detail*
2 *semiannually to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker*
3 *of the House of Representatives with respect to the exercise*
4 *of the authority granted by this title.*

5 *TITLE V*

6 *GENERAL PROVISIONS*

7 *SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary*
8 *of each military department may proceed to establish or*
9 *develop installations and facilities under this Act without*
10 *regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as*
11 *amended (31 U. S. C. 529, 40 U. S. C. 259, 267), and*
12 *sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States*
13 *Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary im-*
14 *provements on land includes authority for surveys, admin-*
15 *istration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to*
16 *construction. That authority may be exercised before title*
17 *to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised*
18 *Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C. 255), and even though*
19 *the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real*
20 *estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to ac-*
21 *quire land, and interests in land (including temporary use),*
22 *by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land,*
23 *or otherwise.*

24 *SEC. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such*
25 *sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but*

1 appropriations, for public works projects authorized by titles
2 I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

3 (1) for title I: Inside the United States,
4 \$104,325,000; outside the United States, \$8,732,000;
5 section 102, \$63,906,000; section 103, \$25,000,000;
6 or a total of \$201,963,000.

7 (2) for title II: Inside the United States,
8 \$216,309,000; outside the United States, \$16,384,000;
9 section 202, \$66,194,000; section 203, \$25,000,000;
10 or a total of \$323,887,000.

11 (3) for title III: Inside the United States,
12 \$541,236,000; outside the United States, \$123,654,000;
13 section 302, \$195,500,000; section 303, \$25,000,000;
14 or a total of \$885,390,000.

15 (4) for title IV: \$233,401,000.

16 SEC. 503. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and
17 III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary con-
18 cerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside
19 the United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside
20 the United States. However, the total cost of all projects
21 in each such title may not be more than the total amount
22 authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

23 SEC. 504. Any outstanding authority heretofore pro-
24 vided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119),

1 *the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of*
2 *August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991), for the provision of family*
3 *housing shall be available for the construction of family*
4 *housing at any installations for which appropriated fund*
5 *family housing is authorized to be constructed under titles*
6 *I and III of this Act.*

7 *SEC. 505. Whenever—*

8 *(1) the President determines that compliance with*
9 *section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for*
10 *contracts made under this Act for the establishment or*
11 *development of military installations and facilities in*
12 *foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of*
13 *this Act; and*

14 *(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller*
15 *General have agreed upon alternative methods of ade-*
16 *quately auditing those contracts; the President may*
17 *exempt those contracts from the requirements of that*
18 *section.*

19 *SEC. 506. Contracts made by the United States under*
20 *this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and super-*
21 *vision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army*
22 *or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy,*
23 *unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because of*
24 *special circumstances such contracts should be executed under*

1 *the jurisdiction and supervision of another Department or*
2 *Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as prac-*
3 *ticable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder,*
4 *if the national security will not be impaired and the award*
5 *is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code,*
6 *and section 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547,*
7 *551). The Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the*
8 *military departments shall report semiannually to the Presi-*
9 *dent of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Repre-*
10 *sentatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other*
11 *than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.*

12 *SEC. 507. As of July 1, 1959, all authorization for mili-*
13 *tary public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of*
14 *a military department in connection with the establishment*
15 *or development of military installations and facilities, and all*
16 *authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained*
17 *in Acts approved before August 4, 1956, and not superseded*
18 *or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed,*
19 *except—*

20 *(1) authorizations for public works and for appro-*
21 *priations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the*
22 *titles that contain the general provisions;*

23 *(2) the authorization for public works projects*
24 *as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for*

1 *construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or*
2 *in part before July 1, 1959, and authorizations for*
3 *appropriations therefor;*

4 (3) *the authorizations for public works and the*
5 *appropriation of funds that are contained in sections*
6 *2231-2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended*
7 *(50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886);*

8 (4) *the authorization for the development of the*
9 *Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$30,-*
10 *000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the*
11 *Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);*

12 (5) *the authorization for development of classified*
13 *facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained*
14 *in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951*
15 *(65 Stat. 336, 343);*

16 (6) *the authorization for public works and for the*
17 *appropriation of funds that are contained in the Act of*
18 *April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended; and*

19 (7) *notwithstanding the provision of section 506 of*
20 *the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 558), the*
21 *authorization for:*

22 (a) *jet engine test cells in the amount of \$1,-*
23 *850,000 at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia,*
24 *that is contained in title II, section 201 under the*
25 *heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and sub-*

1 heading "AVIATION FACILITIES" of the Act of
2 August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 440, 442), as amended;

3 (b) ammunition storage facilities in the
4 amount of \$225,000 at the Naval Auxiliary Air
5 Station, El Centro, California; navigational aids in
6 the amount of \$590,000 at the Marine Corps Air
7 Station, El Toro, California; research and develop-
8 ment facilities in the amount of \$1,804,000 at the
9 Naval Air Turbine Test Station, Trenton, New Jer-
10 sey; and navigational aids in the amount of
11 \$400,000 at the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island,
12 Washington: that are contained in title II, section
13 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED
14 STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES"
15 of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 540),
16 as amended;

17 (c) the development of aviation ordnance facil-
18 ities in the amount of \$2,638,000 that is contained
19 in title II, section 202, of the Act of July 27, 1954
20 (68 Stat. 535, 543), as amended.

21 SEC. 508. Section 408 (b) of the Act of June 17, 1950
22 (64 Stat. 236, 245), is hereby repealed.

23 SEC. 509. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955
24 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to
25 read as follows:

1 “*SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1958 through and in-*
2 *cluding 1961, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air*
3 *Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities*
4 *at or near military tactical installations for assignment as*
5 *public quarters to military personnel and their dependents,*
6 *if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the*
7 *Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack*
8 *of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical*
9 *installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a*
10 *family or individual unit basis and not more than five thou-*
11 *sand of such units may be so leased at any one time. Ex-*
12 *penditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be*
13 *made out of appropriations available for maintenance and*
14 *operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such*
15 *unit.*”

16 *SEC. 510. Section 406 of the Act of August 3, 1956*
17 *(70 Stat. 991, 1015), is amended to read as follows:*

18 “*SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of a military department*
19 *may acquire any interest in land that—*

20 “*(1) he or his designee determines is needed in the*
21 *interest of national defense; and*

22 “*(2) does not cost more than \$25,000 (exclusive of*
23 *administrative costs and the amounts of any deficiency*
24 *judgments).*”

25 *This section does not authorize the acquisition, as part of*

1 the same project, of two or more contiguous parcels of land
2 that together cost more than \$25,000.”

3 SEC. 511. Section 408 (a) of the Act of August 3,
4 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), is amended by adding the fol-
5 lowing new subsection at the end thereof:

6 “(5) No determination that a project is urgently re-
7 quired shall be necessary for projects, the cost of which is
8 not in excess of \$5,000.”

9 SEC. 512. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act
10 of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), is amended to read
11 as follows:

12 “(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law,
13 and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be
14 contracted for or acquired at or in support of military in-
15 stallations or activities unless the actual number of units in-
16 volved has been specifically authorized by an annual military
17 construction authorization Act except (1) housing units
18 acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the
19 Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) housing units leased,
20 utilizing available operation and maintenance appropria-
21 tions, for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for
22 terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions
23 of section 417 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991,
24 1018).

25 SEC. 513. (a) Notwithstanding the authorizations for

1 the construction of family housing contained in subsections 104
2 (a), 204 (a), and 304 (a) of this Act, the total number of
3 units of family housing constructed during fiscal year 1959
4 pursuant to the authority contained in such subsections shall
5 not exceed a total of four thousand units. The Secretary of
6 Defense shall determine the total number of units to be con-
7 structed by each of the military services in conformity with
8 the provisions of this subsection.

9 (b) Notwithstanding the authorizations for the con-
10 struction of family housing contained in subsections 104 (b),
11 204 (b), and 304 (b) of this Act, the total number of units
12 of family housing constructed during fiscal year 1959 pur-
13 suant to the authority contained in such subsections shall not
14 exceed a total of thirty thousand units. The Secretary of
15 Defense shall determine the total number of units to be con-
16 structed by each of the military services in conformity with
17 the provisions of this subsection. The Secretaries of the three
18 military departments, or the designee of each, shall promptly
19 notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and
20 House of Representatives of any determination made here-
21 under as it affects each such department.

22 (c) To the extent that any of the authorizations contained
23 in subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b) of this Act to
24 construct housing at locations specified therein are not utilized,
25 such authorizations may be exercised to construct housing at

1 other locations, except that (1) the total number of housing
2 units to be constructed under the authority of this subsection
3 by any service shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total
4 number of units authorized to be constructed by that service
5 under subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), or 304 (b), as the
6 case may be, and (2) the total number of units constructed
7 by the three services pursuant to this authority shall not,
8 when added to the total number of units constructed pursuant
9 to the authority contained in subsections 104 (b), 204 (b),
10 and 304 (b), exceed the total number of units authorized
11 to be constructed by subsection (b) hereof.

12 (d) (1) Section 404 (c) of the Housing Amendments
13 of 1955, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

14 “(c) (1) Condemnation proceedings instituted pursuant
15 to this section shall be conducted in accordance with the
16 provisions of the Act of August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 357;
17 40 U. S. C. 257), as amended, or any other applicable
18 Federal statute. Before any such condemnation proceed-
19 ings are instituted, an effort shall be made to acquire the
20 property involved by negotiation. In any such condemna-
21 tion proceedings, and in the interests of expedition, the issue
22 of just compensation shall be determined by a commis-
23 sion of three qualified, disinterested persons to be appointed
24 by the court. Any commission appointed hereunder shall
25 give full consideration to all elements of value in accord-

1 *ance with existing law, and shall have the powers of a master*
2 *provided in subdivision (c) of rule 53 of the Federal Rules*
3 *of Civil Procedure and proceedings before it shall be gov-*
4 *erned by the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of sub-*
5 *division (d) of such rule. Its action and report shall be*
6 *determined by a majority and its findings and report shall*
7 *have the effect, and be dealt with by the court in accord-*
8 *ance with the practice prescribed in paragraph (2) of sub-*
9 *division (e) of such rule. Trial of all issues, other than*
10 *just compensation, shall be by the court.*

11 *“(2) In any condemnation proceedings instituted pur-*
12 *suant to this section, the court shall not order the party in*
13 *possession to surrender possession in advance of final judg-*
14 *ment unless a declaration of taking has been filed, and a*
15 *deposit of the amount estimated to be just compensation has*
16 *been made, under the first section of the Act of February 26,*
17 *1931 (46 Stat. 1421), providing for such declarations.*
18 *Unless title is in dispute, the court, upon application, shall*
19 *promptly pay to the owner at least 75 per centum of the*
20 *amount so deposited, but such payment shall be made with-*
21 *out prejudice to any party to the proceeding. In the event*
22 *that condemnation proceedings are instituted in accordance*
23 *with procedures under such Act of February 26, 1931,*
24 *the court shall order that the amount deposited shall be paid*
25 *in a lump sum or over a period not exceeding five years in*

1 accordance with stipulations executed by the parties in the
2 proceedings. In connection with condemnation proceedings
3 which do not utilize the procedures under such Act, the
4 Secretary or his designee, after final judgment of the court,
5 may pay or agree to pay in a lump sum or, in accordance
6 with stipulations executed by the parties to the proceedings,
7 over a period not exceeding five years the difference between
8 the outstanding principal obligation, plus accrued interest,
9 and the price for the property fixed by the court. Unless
10 such payment is made in a lump sum, the unpaid balance
11 thereof shall bear interest at the rate of 4 per centum per
12 annum."

13 (2) The amendment made by this subsection shall be
14 applicable to any condemnation proceedings instituted pur-
15 suant to section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955
16 subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act.

17 SEC. 514. None of the authority contained in titles I,
18 II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any
19 building construction project within the continental United
20 States at a unit cost in excess of—

21 (1) \$32 per square foot for cold-storage ware-
22 housing;

23 (2) \$6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

24 (3) \$1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

25 (4) \$8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

1 *unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of*
 2 *special circumstances, application to such project of the*
 3 *limitations on unit costs contained in this section is im-*
 4 *practicable.*

5 *SEC. 515. Titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this Act may*
 6 *be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1958".*

7 *SEC. 516. Section 407 (e) of Public Law 85-241, ap-*
 8 *proved August 30, 1957, is amended by striking out "July*
 9 *1, 1960" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1962".*

10 *TITLE VI*

11 *RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES*

12 *SEC. 601. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as*
 13 *follows:*

14 *(1) That part of section 2233 (a) that precedes clause*
 15 *(1) thereof is amended to read as follows:*

16 *"§ 2233. Acquisition*

17 *"(a) Subject to sections 2233a, 2234, 2235, 2236, and*
 18 *2238 of this title and subsection (c) of this section, the*
 19 *Secretary of Defense may—".*

20 *(2) Section 2233 is amended by adding the following*
 21 *new subsections at the end thereof:*

22 *"(e) The Secretary of Defense may procure advance*
 23 *planning, construction design, and architectural services in*
 24 *connection with facilities to be established or developed under*
 25 *this chapter which are not otherwise authorized by law.*

1 “(f) Facilities authorized by subsection (a) shall not
 2 be considered ‘military public works’ under the provisions of
 3 the military construction authorization acts that repeal prior
 4 authorizations for military public works.”

5 (3) The following new section is inserted after section
 6 2233:

7 “§ 2233a. Limitation

8 “No expenditure or contribution that is more than
 9 \$50,000 may be made under section 2233 of this title for
 10 any facility that has not been authorized by a law authoriz-
 11 ing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces.
 12 This requirement does not apply to the following:

13 “(a) Facilities acquired by lease.

14 “(b) Facilities acquired, constructed, expanded, re-
 15 habilitated, converted, or equipped to restore or replace
 16 facilities damaged or destroyed, where the Senate and the
 17 House of Representatives have been notified of that ac-
 18 tion.”

19 (4) The analysis of chapter 133 is amended by inserting
 20 the following new item:

“2233a. Limitation.”

21 SEC. 602. (a) Section 3 of the National Defense Facil-
 22 ities Act of 1950, as amended by paragraph (a) of the Act
 23 of August 9, 1955, chapter 662 (69 Stat. 593), and by
 24 section 2 of the Act of August 29, 1957, Public Law 85-215

1 (71 Stat. 489), is amended by striking out the words "in an
2 amount not to exceed \$580,000,000 over a period of the next
3 eight fiscal years commencing with fiscal year 1951,".

4 (b) Section 3 (a) of the National Defense Facilities
5 Act of 1950, as amended by section 414 of the Act of
6 August 3, 1956, chapter 939 (70 Stat. 1018), is amended
7 by striking out the words "and without regard to the mone-
8 tary limitation otherwise imposed by this section".

9 SEC. 603. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United
10 States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or de-
11 velop the following facilities for reserve forces:

12 (1) For Department of the Navy:

13 NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

14 Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta,
15 Georgia: Training facilities, \$480,000.

16 Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Supply facilities and
17 utilities, \$259,000.

18 Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance fa-
19 cilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$652,000.

20 Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Navigational aids
21 and utilities, \$179,000.

22 Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Airfield light-
23 ing, \$147,000.

24 Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, liquid fueling and dispensing
2 facilities, airfield lighting, and land acquisition, \$1,992,000.

3 Naval Air Station, New Orleans (Alvin Callender
4 Field), Louisiana: Administrative facilities, community fa-
5 cilities, navigational aids, operational facilities, supply facili-
6 ties, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,447,000.

7 Naval Air Station, New York, New York: Airfield
8 lighting, \$130,000.

9 Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Opera-
10 tional and training facilities, and utilities, \$652,000.

11 Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational and
12 training facilities, \$570,000.

13 Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts:
14 Utilities, \$407,000.

15 Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Utili-
16 ties, \$99,000.

17 NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

18 Alameda, California: Waterfront operational facilities,
19 \$128,000.

20 Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Bloomington, In-
21 diana: Training facilities, \$95,000.

22 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Bos-
23 ton, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$108,000.

1 *Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Centralia, Wash-*
2 *ington: Training facilities, \$81,000.*

3 *Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Chillicothe, Ohio:*
4 *Training facilities, \$100,000.*

5 *Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Danville, Ken-*
6 *tucky: Training facilities, \$84,000.*

7 *Naval Reserve Training Center, Dunkirk, New York:*
8 *Training facilities, \$79,000.*

9 *Fort Schuyler, New York: Waterfront operational facili-*
10 *ties, \$120,000.*

11 *Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Hayward, Califor-*
12 *nia: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$99,000.*

13 *Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center,*
14 *Honolulu, Hawaii: Training facilities, \$515,000.*

15 *Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Iowa City, Iowa:*
16 *Training facilities \$97,000.*

17 *Master Control Radio Station, New Orleans, Louisiana:*
18 *Communications, \$210,000.*

19 *Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Olympia (Tum-*
20 *water), Washington: Training facilities, \$47,000.*

21 *Naval Reserve Training Center, Pasadena, California:*
22 *Training facilities, \$132,000.*

23 *Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Port Chicago, Cali-*
24 *fornia: Training facilities, \$94,000.*

1 *Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San*
 2 *Jose, California: Land acquisition, \$78,000.*

3 *Saint Petersburg, Florida: Waterfront operational facili-*
 4 *ties, \$26,000.*

5 *Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center.*
 6 *Steubenville, Ohio: Land acquisition, \$18,000.*

7 *Naval Reserve Training Center, White Oak (Lewiston),*
 8 *Maryland: Training facilities, \$557,000.*

9 *Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Yakima, Washing-*
 10 *ton: Training facilities, \$48,000.*

11 MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)

12 *Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Lynchburg,*
 13 *Virginia: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$388,000.*

14 *Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Memphis, Ten-*
 15 *nessee: Training facilities, \$453,000.*

16 *Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center,*
 17 *Moline, Illinois: Training facilities, \$152,000.*

18 *Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center,*
 19 *Pasadena, California: Training facilities, \$163,000.*

20 (2) *For Department of the Air Force:*

21 AIR FORCE RESERVE

22 *Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland:*
 23 *Operational and training facilities, \$129,000.*

1 *Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Opera-*
2 *tional and training facilities, utilities and ground improve-*
3 *ments, and land acquisition, \$3,174,000.*

4 *Bates Field, Mobile, Alabama: Maintenance facility,*
5 *\$97,000.*

6 *Bradley Field, Windsor Locks, Connecticut: Mainte-*
7 *nance facility and utilities and ground improvements,*
8 *\$160,000.*

9 *Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Maintenance facility,*
10 *and supply facility, \$325,000.*

11 *General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Main-*
12 *tenance facility, and operational and training facilities,*
13 *\$173,000.*

14 *Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, New Hampshire:*
15 *Operational and training facilities, \$180,000.*

16 *Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Belton, Missouri:*
17 *Operational and training facilities, \$101,000.*

18 *Naval Air Station (Alvin Callender Field), Orleans*
19 *Parish, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities,*
20 *\$622,000.*

21 *Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Main-*
22 *tenance facility, \$93,000.*

23 *AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES*

24 *Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational*

1 *and training facilities, and hospital and medical facilities,*
2 *\$171,000.*

3 *Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts: Operational and*
4 *training facilities, \$740,000.*

5 *Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel, Minnesota:*
6 *Site improvements, \$500,000.*

7 *Birmingham Municipal Airport, Birmingham, Alabama:*
8 *Operational and training facilities, \$150,000.*

9 *Byrd Field, Richmond, Virginia: Supply facilities,*
10 *\$50,000.*

11 *Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational*
12 *and training facilities, \$579,000.*

13 *Capital Airport, Springfield, Illinois: Supply facilities,*
14 *\$78,000.*

15 *Des Moines Municipal Airport, Des Moines, Iowa:*
16 *Operational and training facilities, \$53,000.*

17 *Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Operational and*
18 *training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and*
19 *utilities and ground improvements, \$1,308,000.*

20 *Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, New Hampshire:*
21 *Operational and training facilities, \$170,000.*

22 *Gulfport Municipal Airport, Gulfport, Mississippi:*
23 *Supply facilities, \$362,000.*

1 *Hayward Municipal Airport, Hayward, California:*
2 *Operational and training facilities, \$113,000.*

3 *Hensley Field, Grand Prairie, Texas: Operational and*
4 *training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,862,000.*

5 *Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational and train-*
6 *ing facilities, and supply facilities, \$159,000.*

7 *Kellogg Field, Battle Creek, Michigan: Operational and*
8 *training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and*
9 *ground improvements, \$1,136,000.*

10 *Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:*
11 *Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities,*
12 *\$570,000.*

13 *Martinsburg Municipal Airport, Martinsburg, West Vir-*
14 *ginia: Operational and training facilities, \$123,000.*

15 *O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Opera-*
16 *tional and training facilities, \$1,099,000.*

17 *Ontario International Airport, Ontario, California:*
18 *Operational and training facilities, \$127,000.*

19 *Portland Municipal Airport, Portland, Oregon: Supply*
20 *facilities and maintenance facilities, \$233,000.*

21 *Rosecrans Field, Saint Joseph, Missouri: Operational*
22 *and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$123,000.*

23 *San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico:*
24 *Supply facilities, \$70,000.*

1 *Sky Harbor Airport, Phoenix, Arizona: Operational and*
 2 *training facilities, \$655,000.*

3 *Standiford Field, Louisville, Kentucky: Operational and*
 4 *training facilities, and administrative facilities, \$715,000.*

5 *Theodore F. Green Airport, Providence, Rhode Island:*
 6 *Operational and training facilities, \$213,000.*

7 *Travis Field, Savannah, Georgia: Housing, supply fa-*
 8 *cilities and utilities, \$317,000.*

9 *Various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, \$300,000.*

10 *(3) For Department of the Army:*

11 ARMY RESERVE

12 *Batavia, New York: Training facilities, \$171,000.*

13 *Beckley, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$289,000.*

14 *Beloit, Wisconsin: Training facilities, \$157,000.*

15 *Canandaigua, New York: Training facilities, \$171,000.*

16 *Canton, Ohio: Training facilities, \$40,000.*

17 *Cheyenne, Wyoming: Training facilities, \$149,000.*

18 *Durant, Oklahoma: Training facilities, \$141,000.*

19 *Fargo, North Dakota: Training facilities, \$149,000.*

20 *Fremont, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.*

21 *Galesburg, Illinois: Training facilities, \$157,000.*

22 *Greenwood, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$85,000.*

1 Hempstead, New York (Nr2): Training facilities,
2 \$536,000.

3 *Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$99,000.*

4 *Kewaunee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, \$157,000.*

5 *Madison, Wisconsin (Nr2): Training facilities,*
6 *\$490,000.*

7 *Oklahoma City, Oklahoma (Nr2): Training facilities,*
8 *\$443,000.*

9 *Saint Marys, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.*

10 *Saint Marys, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$149,000.*

11 *Salinas, California: Training facilities, \$164,000.*

12 *Sinton, Texas: Training facilities, \$134,000.*

13 *Stockton, California: Training facilities, \$164,000.*

14 *Warren, Ohio: Training facilities, \$289,000.*

15 *Weirton, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$149,000.*

16 *San Jose, California: Road improvements, \$32,000.*

17 *Land acquisition: Training facilities, \$419,000.*

18 ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

19 (ARMORY)

20 *Ackerman, Mississippi: Training facilities, \$54,000.*

21 *Agawam, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$210,000.*

2 Amarillo, Texas: Training facilities, \$231,000.

23 *Asheville, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$132,000.*

24 *Ashford, Alabama: Training facilities, \$70,000.*

25 *Atlanta, Georgia: Training facilities, \$132,000.*

- 1 *Batesburg, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.*
- 2 *Batesville, Mississippi: Training facilities, \$54,000.*
- 3 *Beckley, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$200,000.*
- 4 *Belfast, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.*
- 5 *Belmont, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.*
- 6 *Belton, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$122,000.*
- 7 *Belton, Texas: Training facilities, \$86,000.*
- 8 *Berryville, Arkansas: Training facilities, \$45,000.*
- 9 *Berryville, Virginia: Training facilities, \$135,000.*
- 10 *Bethel, Alaska: Training facilities, \$480,000.*
- 11 *Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$45,000.*
- 12 *Boston, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$270,000.*
- 13 *Bridgeport, Alabama: Training facilities, \$70,000.*
- 14 *Brunswick, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.*
- 15 *Caldwell, Ohio: Training facilities, \$135,000.*
- 16 *Calhoun, Georgia: Training facilities, \$110,000.*
- 17 *Camden, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.*
- 18 *Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$45,000.*
- 19 *Catskill, New York: Training facilities, \$300,000.*
- 20 *Chesterfield, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,-*
- 21 *000.*
- 22 *Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$206,000.*
- 23 *Cincinnati, Ohio: Training facilities, \$300,000.*
- 24 *Clarksburg, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$189,-*
- 25 *000.*

- 1 *Clayton, New Mexico: Training facilities, \$57,000.*
- 2 *Clover, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.*
- 3 *Cody, Wyoming: Training facilities, \$142,000.*
- 4 *Concord, New Hampshire: Training facilities, \$375,-*
- 5 *000.*
- 6 *Crossville, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.*
- 7 *Cuero, Texas: Training facilities, \$93,000.*
- 8 *Culver City, California: Training facilities, \$38,000.*
- 9 *Dallas Number 5, Texas: Training facilities, \$154,000.*
- 10 *Dayton, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.*
- 11 *Duluth, Minnesota: Training facilities, \$37,000.*
- 12 *Eatonton, Georgia: Training facilities, \$90,000.*
- 13 *Edna, Texas: Training facilities, \$93,000.*
- 14 *El Campo, Texas: Training facilities, \$104,000.*
- 15 *Espanola, New Mexico: Training facilities, \$57,000.*
- 16 *Fairbanks, Alaska: Training facilities, \$277,000.*
- 17 *Farmville, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.*
- 18 *Fontana, California: Training facilities, \$105,000.*
- 19 *Franklin, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.*
- 20 *Fredericktown, Missouri: Training facilities, \$135,000.*
- 21 *Gainesville, Florida: Training facilities, \$120,000.*
- 22 *Gainesville, Texas: Training facilities, \$111,000.*
- 23 *Gardiner, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.*
- 24 *Gassaway, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$189,000.*

1 *Greensboro, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$357,-*
2 *000.*

3 *Greenville, Ohio: Training facilities, \$165,000.*

4 *Hammonton, New Jersey: Training facilities, \$175,000.*

5 *Harriman, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.*

6 *Hendersonville, North Carolina: Training facilities,*
7 *\$120,000.*

8 *Hollister, California: Training facilities, \$105,000.*

9 *Honey Grove, Texas: Training facilities, \$90,000.*

10 *Houston Number 1, Texas: Training facilities, \$323,000.*

11 *Houston Number 2, Texas: Training facilities, \$264,000.*

12 *Jerome, Idaho: Training facilities, \$52,000.*

13 *Johnston, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.*

14 *Juncos, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, \$38,000.*

15 *Juneau, Alaska: Training facilities, \$450,000.*

16 *Kannapolis, North Carolina: Training facilities,*
17 *\$109,000.*

18 *Kealahukua, Hawaii: Training facilities, \$145,000.*

19 *Ketchikan, Alaska: Training facilities, \$277,000.*

20 *Keyser, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$157,000.*

21 *Kingsport, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$165,000.*

22 *Lake City, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.*

23 *Lasker-Woodland, North Carolina: Training facilities,*
24 *\$103,000.*

- 1 *Laurinburg, North Carolina: Training facilities,*
2 *\$105,000.*
- 3 *Lincolnton, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$95,000.*
- 4 *Ligonier, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$45,000.*
- 5 *Little Rock, Arkansas: Training facilities, \$260,000.*
- 6 *Livingston, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.*
- 7 *Logan, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$189,000.*
- 8 *Lovell, Wyoming: Training facilities, \$142,000.*
- 9 *Marietta, Georgia: Training facilities, \$90,000.*
- 10 *Mayaguez, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, \$160,000.*
- 11 *Middleboro, Kentucky: Training facilities, \$130,000.*
- 12 *Millinocket, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.*
- 13 *Minneapolis, Minnesota: Training facilities, \$88,000.*
- 14 *Nashville, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.*
- 15 *New Bern, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.*
- 16 *New London, Connecticut: Training facilities, \$360,000.*
- 17 *Norfolk, Virginia: Training facilities, \$441,000.*
- 18 *Northwest St. Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities,*
19 *\$130,000.*
- 20 *Oak Ridge, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$142,000.*
- 21 *Ocean Springs, Mississippi: Training facilities, \$54,000.*
- 22 *Pacolet Mills, South Carolina: Training facilities,*
23 *\$99,000.*
- 24 *Patchogue, New York: Training facilities, \$375,000.*

- 1 *Persons, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.*
- 2 *Phoenix, Arizona: Training facilities, \$65,000.*
- 3 *Pitman, New Jersey: Training facilities, \$175,000.*
- 4 *Portland, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.*
- 5 *Preston, Idaho: Training facilities, \$57,000.*
- 6 *Princeton, New Jersey: Training facilities, \$175,000.*
- 7 *Pulaski, Virginia: Training facilities, \$135,000.*
- 8 *Quitman, Georgia: Training facilities, \$90,000.*
- 9 *Reynolds, Georgia: Training facilities, \$90,000.*
- 10 *Richmond, Virginia: Training facilities, \$441,000.*
- 11 *Rigby, Idaho: Training facilities, \$57,000.*
- 12 *Rockingham, North Carolina: Training facilities,*
13 *\$98,000.*
- 14 *Roseboro, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.*
- 15 *Saco, Maine: \$150,000.*
- 16 *Salem, New Jersey: Training facilities, \$15,000.*
- 17 *Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, \$161,000.*
- 18 *Salem, South Dakota: Training facilities, \$150,000.*
- 19 *San Fernando, California: Training facilities, \$115,-*
20 *000.*
- 21 *San Rafael (Fairfax), California: Training facilities,*
22 *\$115,000.*
- 23 *Saranac Lake, New York: Training facilities, \$300,000.*
- 24 *Saugus, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$210,000.*

- 1 *Shallotte, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$95,000.*
- 2 *Silver City, New Mexico: Training facilities, \$57,000.*
- 3 *Sitka, Alaska: Training facilities, \$45,000.*
- 4 *Smithfield, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.*
- 5 *Smithtown, New York: Training facilities, \$300,000.*
- 6 *Socorro, New Mexico: Training facilities, \$57,000.*
- 7 *South Boston, Massachusetts: Training facilities,*
- 8 *\$360,000,*
- 9 *South Pittsburg, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.*
- 10 *South Portland, Maine: Training facilities, \$150,000.*
- 11 *Saint George, South Carolina: Training facilities,*
- 12 *\$99,000.*
- 13 *Stillwater, Minnesota: Training facilities, \$37,000.*
- 14 *Storm Lake, Iowa: Training facilities, \$95,000.*
- 15 *Sturgis, Michigan: Training facilities, \$220,000.*
- 16 *Swanton, Vermont: Training facilities, \$137,000.*
- 17 *Tell City, Indiana: Training facilities, \$188,000.*
- 18 *Texarkana, Texas: Training facilities, \$153,000.*
- 19 *Twin Falls, Idaho: Training facilities, \$90,000.*
- 20 *Valparaiso, Indiana: Training facilities, \$188,000.*
- 21 *Ventura, California: Training facilities, \$115,000.*
- 22 *Wahoo, Nebraska: Training facilities, \$115,000.*
- 23 *Wallace, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$95,000.*
- 24 *Waverly, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.*
- 25 *Waynesboro, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.*

1 *Weston, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$189,000.*

2 *Whitman, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$210,000.*

3 *Whitmire, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.*

4 *Winnemucca, Nevada: Training facilities, \$110,000.*

5 *Yates Center, Kansas: Training facilities, \$93,000.*

6 *Yuma, Arizona: Training facilities, \$45,000.*

7 *ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES*

8 *(NONARMORY)*

9 *Anchorage, Alaska: Administrative and supply facili-*
10 *ties, \$192,000.*

11 *Augusta, Maine: Administrative and supply facilities,*
12 *\$190,000.*

13 *Burlington, Vermont: Administrative and supply facili-*
14 *ties, \$208,000.*

15 *Camp Beauregard, Louisiana: Administrative and*
16 *supply facilities, \$325,000.*

17 *Camp Beauregard, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities,*
18 *\$279,000.*

19 *Camp Butner, North Carolina: Supply facilities, \$353,-*
20 *000.*

21 *Camp Dodge, Iowa: Maintenance facilities, \$80,000.*

22 *Camp Dodge, Iowa: Supply facilities, \$120,000.*

23 *Camp Shelby, Mississippi: Maintenance facilities, \$165,-*
24 *000.*

1 *Columbia, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities,*
2 *\$80,000.*

3 *Concord, New Hampshire: Administrative and supply*
4 *facilities, \$145,000.*

5 *Culbertson, Montana: Maintenance facilities, \$73,000.*

6 *Jefferson City, Missouri: Administrative and supply*
7 *facilities, \$113,000.*

8 *Kalispell, Montana: Maintenance facilities, \$67,000.*

9 *Nashville, Tennessee: Administrative and supply facili-*
10 *ties, \$493,000.*

11 *Salt Lake City, Utah: Maintenance facilities, \$235,000.*

12 *Trenton, New Jersey: Supply facilities, \$80,000.*

13 (4) *For all reserve components: Facilities made nec-*
14 *essary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equip-*
15 *ment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his*
16 *designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclu-*
17 *sion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific*
18 *facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the in-*
19 *terests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense*
20 *or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Repre-*
21 *sentatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to*
22 *implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility*
23 *to be undertaken under this subsection.*

24 *SEC. 604. The first sentence of section 2233a of title 10,*

1 *United States Code, does not apply to—*

2 *(a) facilities that—*

3 *(1) have been the subject of consultation with*
4 *the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the*
5 *House of Representatives before July 1, 1958;*

6 *(2) are under contract before July 1, 1960; and*

7 *(3) are funded from appropriations made before*
8 *the date of enactment of this Act; or*

9 *(b) facilities that are authorized by section 603 (4) of*
10 *this Act; or*

11 *(c) The following facilities for the Air National Guard*
12 *of the United States:*

13 *(1) Milford Point, Connecticut: Operation and train-*
14 *ing facilities, \$337,000.*

15 *(2) Wellesley, Massachusetts: Operational and training*
16 *facilities, \$319,000.*

17 *(3) Westchester County Airport, White Plains, New*
18 *York: Operational and training facilities, \$105,000.*

19 *SEC. 605. The Secretary of Defense may establish or*
20 *develop installations and facilities under this title without*
21 *regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes,*
22 *as amended, and section 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10,*
23 *United States Code. The authority to place permanent or*
24 *temporary improvements on land includes authority for sur-*

1 veys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision
2 incident to construction. That authority may be exercised
3 before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the
4 Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is
5 held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or
6 land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land,
7 and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift,
8 purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

9 *SEC. 606. Appropriations for facilities projects author-*
10 *ized by section 603 for the respective reserve components*
11 *of the armed forces may not exceed—*

12 (1) *for Department of the Navy: Naval and*
13 *Marine Corps Reserves, \$11,886,000.*

14 (2) *for Department of the Air Force:*

15 (a) *Air Force Reserve, \$5,054,000;*

16 (b) *Air National Guard of the United States,*
17 *\$11,976,000.*

18 (3) *for Department of the Army: Army Reserve*
19 *and Army National Guard of the United States,*
20 *\$28,330,000.*

21 *SEC. 607. (a) Any of the amounts named in section 603*
22 *of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense,*
23 *be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all*
24 *projects authorized for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves,*
25 *the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard of the United*

1 *States, and the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard*
2 *of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in*
3 *clauses 1, 2 (a), 2 (b), and 3 of section 606 respectively.*

4 *(b) The Secretary of the Army, Navy, and Air Force,*
5 *respectively, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of De-*
6 *fense, establish or develop facilities for Reserve forces other*
7 *than those facilities authorized by section 603 of this Act,*
8 *except that (1) the total cost of such facilities by any service*
9 *shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total amount authorized*
10 *to be expended by that service for projects under such section,*
11 *and (2) the total cost for all projects established or developed*
12 *by any service under the authority of this subsection shall*
13 *not, when added to the total cost of the projects established*
14 *or developed by such service under the authority of section*
15 *603, exceed the amounts prescribed by clauses 1, 2 (a),*
16 *2 (b), 3, of section 606, respectively.*

17 *SEC. 608. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces*
18 *Facilities Act of 1958".*

Passed the House of Representatives July 10, 1958.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

JULY 11 (legislative day, JULY 10), 1958

Read twice and referred to the Committee on

Armed Services

JULY 28, 1958

Reported with an amendment

public utility districts, the builders, and private and publicly owned utilities, the buyers of electricity. The public utility districts are enabled to sell revenue bonds because they have contracted with utilities, including those in Oregon, to buy most of the power.

But projects which combine big storage for flood control and downstream power benefits with large blocks of at-site power are not attractive to public utility districts, or to private utilities, for that matter. Mr. McKay, who is chairman of the United States section of the International Joint Commission, has not yet broken the deadlock with Canada to assure flood control storage on the Columbia headwaters.

The logical builder of the needed flood control-power projects in the upper basin—Idaho and Montana—is the Federal Government directly, or a Federal agency such as the proposed Regional Power Corporation. Such a corporation, which would market its revenue bonds at a lower interest rate than the public utility districts, would be in an advantageous position. It would pay the power costs and Congress would appropriate funds, as is traditional, for flood control and navigation costs.

An added inducement for Oregon to support a Regional Power Corporation, which Mr. McKay opposes, is that in such legislation lies the opportunity to replace the power preference clause with a fair and equitable distribution clause, or something similar. The long-range need is to assure Oregon consumers a fair share of future Federal power production, not now assured by the preference clause.

Mr. McKay perhaps was misunderstood or had a lapse of memory when he was quoted as saying there haven't been any Federal power dams started in the Northwest under the Eisenhower administration. Democrats in Congress have inserted appropriations in the Eisenhower budgets for several new starts, including John Day, Ice Harbor, Hills Creek, and Cougar, and planning has been authorized for others.

But still there has been neglect of the projects which are most needed—the big storage dams in the upper basin which would reduce the danger of disastrous floods and provide more water for winter power generation when it is needed most. There has also been neglect of the regional necessity for a more equitable distribution of Federal power; the regional system has become a State of Washington system. Mr. McKay would have Oregon depend upon the generosity or fiscal needs of Washington public utility districts, which have prior claim on both the Federal dams and their own.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1958— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3778) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of July 24, 1958, pp. 13606-13608, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to take a half minute to point out for the RECORD the long and arduous work which was involved in consideration of the Transportation Act of 1958. This is probably one of the major bills to be passed by the present Congress. Certainly, with respect to the transportation field, it is one of the most important bills during the many, many years Congress has taken cognizance of such matters.

The Subcommittee on Surface Transportation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as has been pointed out before, when the bill was under consideration, held long hearings and heard many, many scores of witnesses on every phase of our national transportation problem.

The conference itself was almost a Herculean task, in the working out of language which would permit the Senate to get together with the House. The House conferees were very cooperative. I think the conference has produced about as good a bill as possible at this time, considering the area of controversy involved in this field.

As chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I again commend the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the members of the subcommittee, many of whom are on the floor, for what I think is one of the best jobs in the transportation field done in a long, long time.

Mr. SMATHERS rose.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the chairman of the committee for the kind words he has spoken. We have stated previously that this was no one-man effort and represented a great deal of work on the part of Members on both sides of the aisle who are members of the subcommittee.

I am particularly pleased to tell my colleagues in the Senate that the bill as agreed to by the conferees is a considerably improved version over that passed by the Senate and that passed by the House. In this respect, it represents the strongest features of both bills. In fact, it has perfected the measures passed previously by both Houses.

It is truly a constructive piece of legislation. Not only does it charter the way to further strengthen and improve our national transportation system—so vital to our national defense and economic well-being—but it also provides a means to promote a healthy overall economic atmosphere. Without doubt, it is legislation in the public interest. At this point I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a detailed explanation of the manner in which the House conferees and the Senate conferees got together, and the results of their deliberations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF S. 3778, THE TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1958, AS APPROVED BY THE CONFEREES

The bill as finally approved by the conferees covers the following points:

1. Guaranteed loans (a new pt. V, Interstate Commerce Act): Under this part the Interstate Commerce Commission would be authorized to guarantee loans made to railroads from private sources to the amount of \$500 million. The loans must be repaid in 15 years and may be made for the purchase of capital equipment and for maintenance. If a loan is obtained for maintenance purposes, it would be unlawful for a railroad securing a guaranty of the loan to declare dividends on its capital stock during the period the loan is outstanding or while any interest on the loan remains unpaid.

Before a loan could be guaranteed, the Interstate Commerce Commission must: (a) find that without such guaranty the carrier would be unable to secure the necessary funds on reasonable terms; (b) be of the judgment that the loan involved is being made at a reasonable rate of interest; and (c) find that the United States is afforded reasonable protection in its guaranty of the loan.

ICC authority to guarantee loans would expire March 31, 1961 (except for applications pending).

These provisions of the bill are a compromise. The Senate bill would have authorized guaranty of loans for capital expenditures, for all operating expenses (which include maintenance), for working capital, and for interest on existing obligations. The House amendment provided for guaranty of loans for capital expenditures and for loans of not more than 50 percent of the maintenance charges of the carrier for the calendar year preceding the application. As agreed upon in conference, the bill provides for guaranty of loans for capital expenditures and maintenance, with the House limitation of 50 percent eliminated.

As to aggregate principal amount of loans to be guaranteed: the Senate bill provided for \$700 million, of which not more than \$150 million could be loans for operating expenses and interest on existing obligations. The House amendment contained no limitation.

The conferees, after careful consideration, agreed upon \$500 million as the aggregate principal amount of loans to be guaranteed by ICC.

2. Amending ICC authority over intrastate rates. (sec. 4): This section of the bill deals with the authority of the ICC to remove discriminations against interstate commerce primarily by making adjustments in intrastate rates of railroads subject to ICC jurisdiction.

Paragraph (4) of section 13 of the Interstate Commerce Act now empowers ICC to require removal of "any undue or unreasonable advantage, preference, or prejudice as between persons or localities in intrastate commerce, on the one hand, and interstate or foreign commerce, on the other hand, or any undue, unreasonable, or unjust discrimination against interstate or foreign commerce" caused by any intrastate rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice.

Section 4 of the bill as agreed to in conference would amend section 13 (4) in three respects:

1. The first amendment is the insertion of the words "or undue burden on" in the present language describing the protection extended to interstate commerce. The addition of these words would serve to remove any doubt as to the Commission's power in instances where, upon appropriate records, it finds, as it has done in some section 13 proceedings, that the burden cast upon interstate commerce by intrastate rates or charges is undue and therefore unjustly discriminatory. Such findings have been questioned in the courts. This proposed change would thus afford the Commission additional statutory support needed in the administration of section 13.

2. The second amendment deals with the nature of the evidence to support a finding of undue discrimination against or undue burden on interstate commerce.

By two recent decisions of the Supreme Court (*Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Co. v. State of Illinois* (January 13, 1958) (356 U. S. 906), and *Public Service Commission of Utah v. United States* (May 19, 1958) (356 U. S. 421)), the Commission is required to consider the entire State operation, freight and passenger, in determining whether or not intrastate commuter fares, or intrastate freight rates, were causing an undue revenue discrimination against interstate commerce.

Apparently the holdings in these cases mean that the required finding of undue discrimination against, or undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce can be made only in the light of the overall statewide totality of a carriers operating results arising from all the rates applicable within a State.

This would preclude the ICC from making such a finding on a showing of only the effect of the particular intrastate rate or rates in question. The ICC could not under such a rule continue to function effectively in removing unjust discrimination against interstate commerce caused by intrastate rates. In addition, the burden on the carriers of presenting in evidence a separation of interstate and intrastate property, revenue, and expenses would impose an intolerable accounting problem and an almost impossible burden of proof.

As stated in the dissenting opinion of four justices in the Utah case, a consequence of the decisions "would be a radical, and in all likelihood unworkable, change in the way the Commission has administered the provisions of section 13 (4) for over 35 years."

It is essential that the standard of proof acceptable for 35 years be maintained. That is the purpose of this amendment.

3. The third amendment proposes to overcome the policy of comity under which the ICC has generally felt it undesirable to intervene while a matter involving intrastate rates is before a State regulatory commission. This policy has resulted in delays in removing discriminations against and burdens upon interstate commerce. The effect of this amendment would be to require the ICC

to proceed promptly to a determination of such matters.

The above three amendments to paragraph (4) of section 13 do not vest the Commission with jurisdiction that it does not have today but deal with procedures in the exercise of that jurisdiction better to strengthen the protection of interstate commerce as designed in this provision of the act.

These three amendments to section 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act agreed to by the conferees were contained in section 3 of the Senate bill. The House bill had no comparable section.

It should be called to the attention of the Senate that section 3 of the Senate bill also proposed to add a new paragraph (5) to section 13 of the Interstate Commerce Act that would authorize the ICC in a case involving a general adjustment of interstate rates to authorize at the petition of the railroads a comparable adjustment in intrastate rates—if the ICC finds that not to do so would impose an undue burden on interstate commerce.

The bill agreed to in conference does not contain this new paragraph (5) to section 13 from the Senate bill, or any provision based thereon.

3. Discontinuance of train service (sec. 5): Section 5 of the bill as agreed upon by the conferees would add to the Interstate Commerce Act a new section 13a providing a method and procedures to make it possible for carriers by railroad subject to the Interstate Commerce Act to discontinue or change, in whole or in part, the operation or service of trains or ferries operated by such carriers, notwithstanding otherwise applicable State laws. At present the Interstate Commerce Commission has no jurisdiction over discontinuance of railroad service unless abandonment of a line of a railroad is involved.

As both the Senate bill and the House amendment contained provisions on this subject, the members of the conference committee feel that the provisions of section 5 of the bill as agreed to in conference represent a reasonable and workable compromise of the controversial differences between the two versions insofar as these provisions are concerned.

The section would grant authority to discontinue service rendered by trains and ferries crossing State lines to the Interstate Commerce Commission. If enacted, this would invest ICC with authority to discontinue trains that impose a burden on interstate commerce. This provision, however, would not deprive the carrier of the right to go to State commissions to ask for discontinuance of trains crossing State lines. Carriers invoking ICC jurisdiction over a train or ferry would be required to give ample notice to the States in which such train or ferry is located.

State regulatory commissions would retain jurisdiction over stations, depots, and other such facilities.

Jurisdiction over trains operating wholly within a single State would remain with State regulatory commissions. If a State commission does not act on a request for discontinuance within a period of 120 days, or hands down a decision adverse to the applicant carrier, the railroad involved would be given right of petition to the ICC. The Commission would be allowed to grant discontinuance after a full hearing and upon finding that the public convenience and necessity permits such action and that the continued operation constitutes an undue burden upon interstate commerce.

Notice to the State of the filing of such a petition with the ICC would be required, as well as provisions for hearings in the State in which such train or ferry is operated.

The Commission now has power to determine and to act in situations where intrastate rates impose a burden upon interstate

commerce. The section would extend this power to the service itself.

4. Competitive ratemaking (sec. 6): The House and Senate versions were identical on the subject of competitive ratemaking except for a single punctuation mark in the House bill, which would have no effect on the meaning of the legislation. The House receded on changing the punctuation mark, thus restoring the original Senate version of the amendment to the rule of ratemaking in the Interstate Commerce Act.

5. Agricultural exemption in the Interstate Commerce Act (sec. 7): Section 7 of the bill agreed to in conference amends section 203 (b) (6) of the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the exemption from regulation of motor carrier transportation of certain agricultural commodities. Both the Senate bill and the House amendment contained provisions on this subject.

Under the Senate bill the agricultural commodities exemption was frozen, with a slight modification, in accordance with ruling No. 107, dated March 19, 1958, of the Bureau of Motor Carriers, Interstate Commerce Commission. The same was true of the House amendment but the modifications were somewhat different.

Under the conference agreement the agricultural commodities exemption is frozen in accordance with ruling No. 107, referred to above, with the following modification, which is a compromise between the Senate and House provisions:

Returned to economic regulation is the transportation by motor vehicle of frozen fruits, frozen berries, frozen vegetables, cocoa beans, coffee beans, tea, bananas, hemp, wool imported from any foreign country, wool tops and noils, and wool waste which has been carded, spun, woven, or knitted.

Exempted from economic regulation is the transportation of cooked or uncooked (including breaded) fish or shellfish when frozen or fresh, but not including fish and shellfish which have been treated for preserving such as canned, smoked, pickled, spiced, corned, or kippered products.

Under the House amendment any person engaged on July 1, 1958, in trucking the aforementioned commodities which are returned to economic regulation by this amendment would be entitled, upon application, to a certificate or permit allowing him, under regulation, to continue the transportation of the same commodities within the same areas or between the same points. The Senate bill used the date January 1, 1958. The conference agreement uses the date May 1, 1958.

6. Prohibition against illegal for-hire transportation (sec. 8): Section 8 of the bill agreed to in conference amends section 203 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, which prohibits certain operations in the transportation of property by motor vehicle without first obtaining appropriate operating authority.

The Senate bill and the House amendment each proposed to amend this provision, and the amendments proposed were quite similar but not identical.

The Senate bill provided "nor shall any person in any other commercial enterprise transport property by motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce unless such transportation is incidental to, and in furtherance of a primary business enterprise (other than transportation) of such person."

The conference agreement provides "nor shall any person engaged in any other business enterprise transport property by motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce for business purposes unless such transportation is within the scope, and in furtherance, of a primary business enterprise (other than transportation) of such person."

This amendment is designed to strengthen the hand of the Interstate Commerce Commission in eliminating illegal buy-and-sell

cise tax on passenger transportation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall close by citing as an example the Long Island Railroad, to which I referred a moment ago.

This railroad is the only line in the East which does not operate commuter service at a net loss thanks to tax forgiveness granted by the State and the city of New York, and the tax loss carryovers which exempt it from payment of Federal income tax. However, in 1959, when this Federal loss benefit has been exhausted, the earnings of the Long Island Railroad will be taxed by the Federal Government at the rate of 52 percent. The Federal Treasury will then become the recipient under provisions of the present Internal Revenue Code of much of the tax forgiveness now granted by the city and State. If that happens, serious doubts have been expressed on the feasibility of proceeding with plans to reduce fares and install new equipment for more efficient and safer passenger service.

It is by now a well-known fact that the East is no exception; that commuter service operates at a net loss almost everywhere in the Nation. The ICC will be empowered under the approved bill to grant requests for cancellation where such service imperils the financial future of the railroads' overall operations. Federal action taken promptly to encourage States and localities to grant tax relief to these lines will rescue many lines from precarious financial situations, permitting them better to serve the daily transportation needs of the Nation.

The commuter problem is a very grave problem throughout the entire country, in the transition period between great advances in the techniques of transportation. I feel that the kind of immediate help which we are giving in the Transportation Act of 1958, and which is being given by States and cities will be materially promoted by the enactment of the legislation which I am introducing today. I feel that it is so urgent that I hope it will have high priority attention from the Committee on Finance, which would be required were it to pass at this session.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business automatically comes before the Senate.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Technical Services Facilities

Ordnance Corps

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,697,000.

Detroit Arsenal, Mich.: Administrative facilities, \$5,666,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Ala.: Administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$8,529,000.

Rock Island Arsenal, Ill.: Operational and training facilities, \$570,000.

White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, research, development and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$7,931,000.

Quartermaster Corps

Fort Lee, Va.: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$4,630,000.

Chemical Corps

Army Chemical Center, Md.: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

Fort Detrick, Md.: Troop housing, \$795,000.

Signal Corps

Fort Huachuca, Ariz.: Maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$9,098,000.

Corps of Engineers

Army Map Service, Md.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,913,000.

Transportation Corps

Fort Eustis, Va.: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,634,000.

Medical Corps

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colo.: Troop housing, \$862,000.

Field Forces Facilities

First Army area

Fort Devens, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, \$171,000.

Fort Dix, N. J.: Troop housing and utilities, \$3,749,000.

Second Army area

Carlisle Barracks, Pa.: Family housing, and real estates, \$374,000.

Fort Knox, Ky.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$516,000.

Fort Meade, Md.: Operational and training facilities, \$498,000.

Fort Ritchie, Md.: Supply facilities, \$43,000.

Third Army area

Fort Benning, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and family housing, \$3,454,000.

Fort Bragg, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$762,000.

Fort Campbell, Ky.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and administrative facilities, \$847,000.

Fort McClelland, Ala.: Operational and training facilities, \$174,000.

Fort Rucker, Ala.: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,406,000.

Fourth Army area

Fort Bliss, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$13,734,000.

Fort Hood, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,258,000.

Fort Sill, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$3,227,000.

Fifth Army area

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.: Troop housing, and family housing, \$783,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,076,000.

Fort Riley, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,084,000.

Sixth Army area

Camp Desert Rock, Nev.: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$374,000.

Fort Lewis, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,085,000.

Fort Ord, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,733,000.

Yuma Test Station, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, \$173,000.

Military Academy

United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.: Troop housing, medical facilities, and community facilities, \$5,884,000.

Armed Forces special weapons

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$273,000.

Tactical Installations support facilities
Various locations: Maintenance facilities, \$6,311,000.

Outside Continental United States

Alaskan area

Fairbanks Permafrost Research area: Real estate, \$7,000.

Pacific command area

Kawaihae Harbor, T. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$240,000.

Schofield Barracks, T. H.: Troop housing, \$593,000.

Fort Shafter, T. H.: Supply facilities, maintenance facilities, family housing, and community facilities, \$2,925,000.

Korea: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$904,000.

United States Army, Europe

France: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,063,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$63,906,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unfore-

seen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$25 million: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real-estate actions pertaining thereto.

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, and subject to the provisions of section 513 of this act, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 298 units.
Vicenza, Italy, 371 units.
Army Security Agency, location 13, 91 units.
Gateway Communications Station, 174 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Inside the United States

Redstone Arsenal, Ala., 316 units.
Seneca Ordnance Depot, N. Y., 120 units.
White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex., 200 units.
Fort Monmouth, N. J., 130 units.
Fort Lee, Va., 435 units.
Natick R&E, Mass., 35 units.
Fort Belvoir, Va., 618 units.
Two Rock Ranch Station, Calif., 25 units.
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 50 units.
Beaumont Army Hospital, Tex., 125 units.
Fort Totten, N. Y., 130 units.
Fort Campbell, Ky., 837 units.
Granite City Engineer Depot, Ill., 65 units.
Fort Rucker, Ala., 400 units.
Fort Stewart, Ga., 73 units.
Fort Bliss, Tex., 410 units.
Fort Hood, Tex., 500 units.
Fort Sill, Okla., 349 units.
Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., 700 units.
Fort Leavenworth, Kans., 200 units.
Fort Sheridan, Ill., 50 units.
Forts Baker and Barry, Calif., 98 units.
Oakland Army Terminal, Calif., 88 units.
Fort Lewis, Wash., 856 units.
Branch United States Disciplinary Barracks, Calif., 160 units.
United States Military Academy, N. Y., 156 units.
Bossier Base, La., 200 units.
Medina Base, Tex., 125 units.
Sandia Base, N. Mex., 213 units.
Army Air Defense Command Stations, 466 units.

Outside the United States

Canal Zone, 330 units.
Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, 385 units.
Fort Shafter, Hawaii, 481 units: *Provided*, however, That no family housing units shall be constructed on Fort DeRussy.

(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Sec-

retary of the Army is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Aberdeen, Md., 796 units.
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 400 units.
Fort Sam Houston, Tex., 840 units.
Fort Sill, Okla., 500 units.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 209, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "Technical Service Facilities (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Pueblo Ordnance Depot, Colo., strike out "\$563,000" and insert in place thereof "\$600,000."

(b) Public Law 209, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$44,407,000" and "\$134,075,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$44,444,000" and "\$134,112,000", respectively.

SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Ala., strike out "\$2,865,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,180,000."

(2) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Monmouth, N. J., strike out "\$615,000" and insert in place thereof "\$731,000"; and with respect to Vint Hill Farms Station, Va., strike out "\$695,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,022,000."

(3) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Corps of Engineers)", with respect to Granite City Engineer Depot, Ill., strike out "\$1,822,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,815,000."

(4) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Medical Corps)", with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, strike out "\$4,472,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,714,000."

(5) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Second Army Area)", with respect to Fort George G. Meade, Md., strike out "\$923,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,264,000."

(6) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Fourth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Bliss, Tex., strike out "\$4,645,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,965,000"; and with respect to Fort Sill, Okla., strike out "\$3,053,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,454,000."

(7) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Sixth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Ord, Calif., strike out "\$1,407,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,742,000."

(8) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Military Academy)", with respect to the United States Military Academy, N. Y., strike out "\$756,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,171,000."

(b) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$237,320,000" and "\$546,387,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$244,125,000" and "\$553,192,000", respectively.

SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to White Sands Proving Ground, N. Mex., strike out "\$693,000" and insert in place thereof "\$735,000."

(2) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Chemical Corps)", with respect to Camp Detrick, Md., strike out "\$913,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,074,000"; and with respect to Dugway Prov-

ing Ground, Utah, strike out "\$867,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,044,000."

(3) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Huachuca, Ariz., strike out "\$6,856,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,576,000."

(4) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Corps of Engineers)", with respect to Fort Belvoir, Va., strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000."

(5) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Transportation Corps)", with respect to Fort Eustis, Va., strike out "\$1,231,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,436,000."

(6) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (First Army Area)", with respect to Fort Dix, N. J., strike out "\$54,000" and insert in place thereof "\$68,000."

(7) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Second Army Area)", with respect to Fort George G. Meade, Md., strike out "\$5,885,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,695,000."

(8) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Third Army Area)", with respect to Fort Benning, Ga., strike out "\$422,000" and insert in place thereof "\$616,000"; and with respect to Fort McClellan, Ala., strike out "\$397,000" and insert in place thereof "\$527,000."

(9) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Fourth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Hood, Tex., strike out "\$2,457,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,846,000."

(10) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Riley, Kans., strike out "\$1,519,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,892,000."

(11) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Sixth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Lewis, Wash., strike out "\$3,022,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,596,000"; and with respect to Ford Ord, Calif., strike out "\$223,000" and insert in place thereof "\$319,000."

(b) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Outside the United States" in section 101, as follows:

Under the subheading "(Alaskan Area)", with respect to Wildwood Station (Kenai), strike out "\$352,000" and insert in place thereof "\$516,000."

(c) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 402 the amounts "\$95,010,000," "\$35,763,000," and "\$334,104,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$100,343,000," "\$35,927,000," and "\$339,601,000," respectively.

SEC. 108. (a) Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Corps of Engineers)" with respect to Cold Regions Laboratory, Hanover, N. H., strike out "\$2,496,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,787,000."

(b) Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$115,624,000" and "\$293,103,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$116,915,000" and "\$294,394,000."

SEC. 110. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed, unless the Secretary of Defense finds after due investigation that such action would be inimical to the national security, to make available to the Administrator of the General Services Administration, or his designee, the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Tex. Upon such property being made available, the Administrator or his designee is authorized and directed to enter into a contract or contracts for the sale of such property in lots or in its entirety under public bid procedures and at not less than the fair market value and to convey by quitclaim deed, all right, title, and interest of the

United States, except as retained in this act, in and to such property to any legal person or group except Government agencies or departments upon such terms and conditions as the Administrator or his designee determines to be in the public interest.

(b) Any conveyance made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) hereof shall include the following conditions:

(1) All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands to be conveyed shall be reserved to the United States;

(2) The San Jacinto property shall be offered for sale within 36 months from the date of enactment of this act;

(3) Title in and to such property shall remain in the United States until full payment of the agreed purchase price is made.

(c) In the event the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot is made available to the General Services Administration pursuant to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) hereof, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Army such sums as are necessary not to exceed \$40 million to establish and construct, including land acquisition, replacement facilities to the extent required at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala., or any other location selected by the Secretary of Defense.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Shipyard facilities

Naval Facility, Cape May, N. J.: Operational and training facilities, \$141,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$6 million: *Provided, however,* That no more than \$500,000 of this sum shall be utilized for protective works until the Secretary of the Navy determines in his judgment that sufficient action has been taken or arrangements made to arrest further subsidence of the shipyard.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn.: Operational and training facilities, \$2,247,000.

Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$766,000.

Fleet Base Facilities

Naval Station, Newport, R. I.: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,709,000.

Naval Base, Norfolk, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$2,546,000.

Aviation Facilities

Naval air training stations

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Tex.: Troop housing, \$1,041,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$14,940,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$4,679,000.

Fleet support air stations

Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$114,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Fla.: Maintenance facilities, \$1,252,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$47,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nev.: Operational and training facilities, \$80,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Fentress, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, administrative facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$11,215,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, \$74,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$15,823,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$9,892,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, Calif.: Operational facilities, and real estate, \$7 million.

Naval Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

Marine Corps air stations

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, S. C.: Operational and training facilities and real estate, \$4,352,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, \$8,946,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,067,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,003,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$2,158,000.

Special purpose air stations

Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Md.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, utilities, and operational and training facilities at the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md., \$17,666,000.

Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing (including operational and training facilities and troop housing on San Nicolas Island; and maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements at Camp Cooke), \$13,841,000.

Supply Facilities

Naval Supply Depot, Newport, R. I.: Utilities, \$2,210,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Va.: Administrative facilities, \$128,000.

Naval Supply Center, Oakland, Calif.: Administrative facilities, \$146,000.

Marine Corps Facilities

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$280,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S. C.: Utilities, \$462,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,138,000.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$168,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, Calif.: Utilities, \$206,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, \$241,000.

Ordnance Facilities

Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Wash.: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Calif.: Supply facilities, \$129,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, \$2,517,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, Calif.: Research, development, and test facilities, \$510,000.

Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Va.: Research, development, and test facilities, \$44,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Hingham, Mass.: Maintenance facilities, \$694,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md.: Research, development, and test facilities, \$601,000.

Service School Facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: Troop housing \$14,200,000.

Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,184,000.

Naval Receiving Station, District of Columbia: Operational facilities, \$650,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,368,000.

Naval War College, Newport, R. I.: Operational and training facilities, \$273,000.

Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$4,643,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$4,199,000.

Medical Facilities

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md.: Hospital and medical facilities, \$8,503,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational and training facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$38,654,000.

Office of Naval Research Facilities

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development, and test facilities, \$192,000.

Outside the United States

Shipyard Facilities

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, T. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$159,000.

Aviation Facilities

Naval Air Station, Agana, Mariana Islands: Operation and training facilities, and real estate, \$4,414,000.

Naval Station, Bermuda, British West Indies: Operational and training facilities, \$683,000.

Naval Air Station, Ford Island, T. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,271,000.

Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Supply facilities, \$165,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, P. R.: Operational and training facilities, \$3,824,000.

Supply Facilities

Naval Supply Depot, Guam, Mariana Islands: Supply facilities, \$3,060,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Communication Unit No. 3, Asmara, Eritrea: Operational and training facilities, \$1,180,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Operational and training facilities, \$219,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Port Lyautey, Morocco: Operational and training facilities, \$519,000.

Yards and Docks Facilities

Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$890,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$66,194,000.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop naval installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy mis-

sions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$25 million: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, and subject to the provisions of section 513 of this act, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Naval Magazine, Cartagena, Spain, 46 units, and community facilities.

Naval Magazine, El Ferrol, Spain, 45 units, and community facilities.

Naval Air Station, Port Lyautey, Morocco, 330 units.

Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Italy, 122 units, and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Inside the United States

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, 277 units.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, N. C., 800 units.

Naval Facility, Cape Hatteras, N. C., 27 units.

Naval Facility, Centerville, Calif., 24 units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C., 849 units.

Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oreg., 24 units.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill., 425 units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif., 800 units.

Naval Facility, Nantucket, Mass., 19 units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn., 500 units.

Naval Facility, Pacific Beach, Wash., 30 units.

Naval Facility, Point Sur, Calif., 24 units.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Wash., 550 units.

Naval Ordnance Missile Test Facility, White Sands Proving Grounds, N. Mex., 51 units.

Outside the United States

Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, T. H., 1,140 units.

Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, Headquarters, Camp H. M. Smith, Oahu, T. H., 168 units.

Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands, 220 units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, T. H., 650 units.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, T. H., 80 units.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, T. H., 650 units.

(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif., 1,562 units.

Marine Corps Training Center, Twenty-nine Palms, Calif., 493 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Fla., 96 units.

Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head Md., 385 units.

Naval Station, Green Cove Springs, Fla., 392 units.

Squantum Gardens, Mass., 150 units.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, 82d Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "medical facilities," with respect to the Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Va. area, strike out "\$12,815,000" and insert in place thereof "\$13,979,000."

(b) Public Law 534, 82d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$139,143,000" and "\$266,927,000," and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$140,307,000," and "\$268,091,000."

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 534, 83rd Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "\$70,656,000," and inserting in place thereof "\$72,785,000."

(b) Public Law 534, 83rd Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$70,656,000," and "\$210,704,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$72,785,000," and "\$212,833,000."

SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 201 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Marine Corps facilities," with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif., strike out "\$648,000" and insert in place thereof "\$778,000."

(2) Under the subheading "ordnance facilities," with respect to the Naval Underwater Ordnance Station, Newport, R. I., strike out "\$370,000" and insert in place thereof "\$411,000."

(b) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Outside Continental United States" in section 201, as follows:

Under subheading "aviation facilities," with respect to the Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Marianas Islands, by striking out "\$6,525,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$9,063,000" and with respect to the Naval Station, Argentia, Newfoundland, by striking out "\$3,589,800" and inserting in place thereof "\$9,089,800."

(c) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$308,463,600," "\$108,365,300," and "\$575,592,300" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$308,634,600," "\$111,403,300," and "\$578,801,300."

SEC. 208. (a) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "fleet base facilities," with respect to the Naval Station, Newport, R. I., strike out "\$11,672,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,601,000."

(2) Under the subheading "aviation facilities (Naval Air Training Station)," with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Tex., strike out "\$2,247,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,569,000"; and with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Miss., strike out \$8,231,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,141,000."

(3) Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities (Marine Corps Air Stations)," with

respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C., strike out "\$170,000" and insert in place thereof "\$273,000."

(4) Under the subheading "Service School Facilities," with respect to the Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Va., strike out "\$237,000" and insert in place thereof "\$300,000," and with respect to the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill., strike out "\$8,413,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,613,000."

(5) Under the subheading "Medical Facilities," with respect to the Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Ill., strike out "\$12,730,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,754,000."

(b) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 203 "\$85,939,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$86,711,000."

(c) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$303,453,000," "\$85,939,000," and "\$451,393,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$312,004,000," "\$86,711,000," and "\$460,716,000."

SEC. 209. Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities (Special Purpose Air Stations)," with respect to the Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, Calif., insert before "\$7,669,000" the words "and land acquisition,".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Air Defense Command

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minn.: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$2,649,000.

Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vt.: Troop housing, \$990,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Mont.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$10,659,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, N. Dak.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,176,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$10,673,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oreg.: Community facilities, and utilities, \$229,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, \$9,948,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$935,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,721,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and utilities, \$3,689,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, Calif.: Medical facilities, \$122,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, ad-

ministrative facilities, and real estate, \$2,799,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,579,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, N. Y.: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wis.: Troop housing, and ground improvements, \$795,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$3,992,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$8,696,000.

Air Materiel Command

Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Ala.: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$975,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$1,177,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,746,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Utilities, \$157,000.

Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pa.: Supply facilities, \$94,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, \$1,560,000.

Memphis General Depot, Memphis, Tenn.: Administrative facilities, \$1,464,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, Calif.: Supply facilities, \$658,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pa.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$61,169,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,362,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$5,196,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, \$11,037,000.

Air Research and Development Command

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, Calif.: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, \$981,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$10,109,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, N. Mex.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$1,650,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$481,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass.: Maintenance facilities, \$165,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,884,000.

School of Aviation Medicine

School of Aviation Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community

facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, \$12,000,000.

Air Training Command

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$979,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$1,584,000.

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Ill.: Troop housing, \$640,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Ala.: Troop housing, \$400,000.

Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$208,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex.: Troop housing, \$750,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Ariz.: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$441,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,213,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, \$2,119,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, \$5,432,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nev.: Maintenance facilities, \$358,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Tex.: Maintenance facilities, \$319,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$245,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nev.: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$571,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,770,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$3,081,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,361,000.

Continental Air Command

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Troop housing, \$1,805,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$11,589,000.

Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Ga.: Utilities, \$172,000.

Headquarters Command

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Md. Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$18,937,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, S. C. Maintenance facilities, \$78,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$2,874,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, N. J.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,901,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Ill.: Troop housing, \$423,000.

Strategic Air Command

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,051,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, La.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,355,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,868,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,080,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Ark.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,654,000.

Brunswick Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$11,417,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Ind.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,996,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$2,257,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$4,183,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,734,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,939,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,174,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,404,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,346,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,931,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$4,094,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,703,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,489,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,493,000.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, La.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$3,401,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,795,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$897,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebr.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,250,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Ark.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,463,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$11,716,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$3,774,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,577,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,832,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$3,344,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,137,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$1,039,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$3,265,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N. H.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$940,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, N. Y.: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$208,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wis.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$15,552,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,352,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,997,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$8,431,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Mass.: Troop housing, \$945,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,185,000.

Tactical Air Command

George Air Force Base, Victorville, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, \$536,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Va.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,371,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, S. C.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,650,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tenn.: Troop housing, \$591,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,707,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, S. C.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,339,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,474,000.

Special facilities

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$563,000.

Aircraft control and warning system

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$169,833,000.

Outside the United States

Air Materiel Command

Various locations: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$696,000.

Alaskan Air Command

Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, \$380,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, \$710,000.

King Salmon Airport: Operational and training facilities, \$340,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$24,986,000.

Caribbean Air Command

Howard Air Force Base, C. Z.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,540,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$5,347,000.

Pacific Air Forces

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, T. H.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$144,000.

Midway Island: Supply facilities, \$839,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$15,688,000.

Strategic Air Command

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,508,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, P. R.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$643,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$21,431,000.

United States Air Forces in Europe

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$19,952,000.

Aircraft control and warning system

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$29,135,000.

Special facilities

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$315,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic and strategic missiles by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$195,500,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$25 million: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, and subject to the provisions of section 513 of this act, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Lajes Field, Azores, 306 units.
Kindley Air Force Base, Bermuda, 300 units.

Laon, France, 102 units.
Keflavik Airport, Iceland, 300 units.
Benguerir Airport, Morocco, 248 units.
Sidi Slimane Air Base, Morocco, 295 units.
Clark Air Force Base, Philippines, 900 units.

Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, 200 units.
Madrid-Torrejon area, Spain, 460 units.
Moron-San Pablo area, Spain, 40 units.
Various locations, Spain, 120 units, and community facilities.

Zaragoza Air Base, Spain, 176 units.
Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 50 units.

Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 190 units.

Bruntingthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 93 units.

Brize Norton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 215 units.

Chelveston RAF Station, United Kingdom, 79 units.

Chicksands Priory RAF Station, United Kingdom, 83 units.

Fairford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 177 units.

High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 110 units.

Lakenheath-Mildenhall area, United Kingdom, 55 units, and community facilities.

Stansted-Mountfitchet RAF Station, United Kingdom, 22 units.

Upper Heyford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 259 units.

Wethersfield, RAF Station, United Kingdom, 416 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Inside the United States

Camp Adair Air Force Station, Oreg., 150 units.

Amarillo Air Force Base, Tex., 500 units.

Beale Air Force Base, Calif., 970 units.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Ind., 250 units.

Chanute Air Force Base, Ill., 450 units.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 536 units.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Okla., 50 units.

Custer Air Force Station, Mich., 169 units.

Donaldson Air Force Base, S. C., 275 units.

Cooke Air Force Base, Calif., 525 units.

Dover Air Force Base, Del., 500 units.

Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 530 units.

Duluth Municipal Airport, Minn., 365 units.

Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., 778 units.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak., 220 units.

Forbes Air Force Base, Kans., 414 units.

Fort Lee Air Force Station, Va., 154 units.

Geiger Field, Wash., 168 units.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Mont., 460 units.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak., 744 units.

Griffiss Air Force Base, N. Y., 270 units.

Hamilton Air Force Base, Calif., 550 units.

Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex., 400 units.

James Connally Air Force Base, Tex., 366 units.

Keesler Air Force Base, Miss., 290 units.

Kinross Air Force Base, Mich., 475 units.

K. I. Sawyer Airport, Mich., 595 units.

Kirtland Air Force Base, N. Mex., 490 units.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, La., 300 units.

Langley Air Force Base, Va., 500 units.

Larson Air Force Base, Wash., 200 units.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio, 400 units.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont., 150 units.

Mather Air Force Base, Calif., 220 units.

McChord Air Force Base, Wash., 1,000 units.

McClellan Air Force Base, Calif., 540 units.

McCoy Air Force Base, Fla., 668 units.

McGuire Air Force Base, N. J., 1,450 units.

Minot Air Force Base, N. Dak., 932 units.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 270 units.

Nellis Air Force Base, Nev., 200 units.

Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, N. Y., 290 units.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr., 616 units.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Calif., 315 units.

Pease Air Force Base, N. H., 483 units.

Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wis., 900 units.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Mo., 610 units.

Robins Air Force Base, Ga., 150 units.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mich., 580 units.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex., 500 units.

Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa, 325 units.

Stewart Air Force Base, N. Y., 300 units.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, N. Y., 220 units.

Syracuse Air Force Station, N. Y., 216 units.

Topsham Air Force Station, Maine, 177 units.

Truax Field, Wis., 280 units.

Turner Air Force Base, Ga., 200 units.

United States Air Force Academy, Colo., 300 units.

Vance Air Force Base, Okla., 230 units.

Westover Air Force Base, Mass., 310 units.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo., 154 units.

Williams Air Force Base, Ariz., 150 units.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich., 618 units.

Outside the United States

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, 1,050 units.

Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, 600 units.

(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:

Brookley Air Force Base, Ala., 175 units.

Carswell Air Force Base, Tex., 600 units.

Craig Air Force Base, Ala., 225 units.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Ariz., 550 units.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyo., 500 units.

Hunter Air Force Base, Ga., 500 units.

Kelly Air Force Base, Tex., 592 units.

Lowry Air Force Base, Colo., 480 units.

March Air Force Base, Calif., 644 units.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., 250 units.

Mitchel Air Force Base, N. Y., 628 units.

Randolph Air Force Base, Tex., 612 units.

Reese Air Force Base, Tex., 418 units.

Shaw Air Force Base, S. C., 400 units.

Walker Air Force Base, N. Mex., 800 units.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, 2,000 units.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "Continental United States" in section 301 as follows:

Under the subheading "Air Defense Command," with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass., strike out "\$6,076,000," and insert in place thereof "\$6,522,000."

Under the subheading "Air Materiel Command," with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out "\$14,508,000" and insert in place thereof "\$15,800,000."

(b) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "\$824,300,000" and "\$1,363,189,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$826,038,000" and "\$1,364,927,000," respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "Air Defense Command"—

(1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minn., strike out "\$1,469,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,636,000."

(2) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass., strike out "\$11,577,000" and insert in place thereof "\$13,341,000."

Under the subheading "Air Materiel Command," with respect to Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, strike out "\$1,339,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,661,000."

Under the subheading "Air Training Command," with respect to James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex., strike out "\$4,687,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,301,000."

Under the subheading "Strategic Air Command" with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont., strike out "\$1,586,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,726,000."

(b) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the amounts "\$811,342,000" and "\$1,447,950,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$814,349,000" and "\$1,450,957,000," respectively.

SEC. 307. (a) Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended, under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "Air Defense Command"—

(1) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Mont., strike out "\$2,048,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,390,000."

(2) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Mo., strike out "\$1,100,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,348,000."

(3) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak., strike out "\$6,804,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,507,000."

(4) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass., strike out "\$559,000" and insert in place thereof "\$615,000."

Under the subheading "Air Materiel Command," with respect to Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex., strike out "\$899,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,128,000."

Under the subheading "Air Training Command," with respect to Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Tex., strike out "\$460,000" and insert in place thereof "\$637,000."

Under the subheading "Strategic Air Command"—

(1) with respect to Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, La., strike out "\$3,344,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,633,000."

(2) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, Calif., strike out "\$7,458,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,087,000."

(3) with respect to MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Fla., strike out "\$936,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,268,000."

(4) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N. H., strike out "\$2,344,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,947,000."

(5) with respect to Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Mo., strike out "\$235,000" and insert in place thereof "\$306,000."

(b) Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "\$394,076,000" and "\$601,781,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$399,755,000" and "\$607,460,000," respectively.

SEC. 308. (a) Public Law 85-325, 85th Congress, is amended, under the heading

"Alert and Dispersal of Strategic Air Command Forces" in section 1, as follows:

(1) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, N. Dak., strike out "\$895,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,892,000."

(2) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak., strike out "\$867,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,479,000."

(3) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out "\$4,380,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,479,000."

(4) With respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr., strike out "\$690,000" and insert in place thereof "\$969,000."

(b) Public Law 85-325, 85th Congress, is amended by striking out in section 3 the amount "\$549,670,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$552,657,000."

SEC. 309. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure "\$135,425,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure "\$139,797,000."

SEC. 310. The last paragraph under the heading "Research and Development Command" in title III of Public Law 161, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 342), is amended to read as follows:

"Various locations: Research, development, and operational facilities (including not more than \$357,000 for an off-base roadway approximately 10 miles in length in the vicinity of the north boundary of Cape Canaveral—an auxiliary to Patrick Air Force Base) \$20,000,000."

The amendment made by this section is effective from March 1, 1956.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities required for advanced research projects and in connection therewith may acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000.

SEC. 402. The Secretary of Defense or his designee may establish or develop classified installations and facilities for defense missiles by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating or installing permanent or temporary works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$183,401,000.

SEC. 403. The Secretary of Defense shall report in detail semiannually to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to the exercise of the authority granted by this title.

TITLE V

General provisions

SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 529, 40 U. S. C. 259, 267), and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this act, but appropria-

tions for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$104,325,000; outside the United States, \$8,732,000; section 102, \$63,906,000; section 103, \$25 million; or a total of \$201,963,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$216,309,000; outside the United States, \$16,384,000; section 202, \$66,194,000; section 203, \$25 million; or a total of \$323,887,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$541,236,000; outside the United States, \$123,654,000; section 302, \$195,500,000; section 303, \$25 million; or a total of \$885,390,000.

(4) for title IV: \$233,401,000.

SEC. 503. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 percent for projects inside the United States and by 10 percent for projects outside the United States. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 504. Any outstanding authority heretofore provided by the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991), for the provision of family housing shall be available for the construction of family housing at any installations for which appropriated fund family housing is authorized to be constructed under titles I and III of this act.

SEC. 505. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts; the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 506. Contracts made by the United States under this act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because of special circumstances such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and section 15 of the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547, 551). The Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 507. As of July 1, 1959, all authorization for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in acts approved before August 4, 1956, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds

have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1959, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorizations for public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in sections 2231–2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886);

(4) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$30 million that is contained in title I, section 102, of the act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(5) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

(6) the authorization for public works and for the appropriation of funds that are contained in the act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended; and

(7) notwithstanding the provision of section 506 of the act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 558), the authorization for:

(a) jet engine test cells in the amount of \$1,850,000 at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., that is contained in title II, section 201 under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Aviation Facilities" of the act of August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 440, 442), as amended;

(b) ammunition storage facilities in the amount of \$225,000 at the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, Calif.; navigational aids in the amount of \$590,000 at the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, Calif.; research and development facilities in the amount of \$1,804,000 at the Naval Air Turbine Test Station, Trenton, N. J.; and navigational aids in the amount of \$400,000 at the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Wash.: that are contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Aviation Facilities" of the act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 540), as amended;

(c) the development of aviation ordnance facilities in the amount of \$2,638,000 that is contained in title II, section 202, of the act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 543), as amended.

SEC. 508. Section 408 (b) of the act of June 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 236, 245), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 509. Section 515 of the act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1958 through and including 1961, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than 5,000 of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 510. Section 406 of the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1015), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of a military department may acquire any interest in land that—

"(1) he or his designee determines is needed in the interest of national defense; and

"(2) does not cost more than \$25,000 (exclusive of administrative costs and the amounts of any deficiency judgments).

This section does not authorize the acquisition, as part of the same project, of two or more contiguous parcels of land that together cost more than \$25,000."

SEC. 511. Section 408 (a) of the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(5) No determination that a project is urgently required shall be necessary for projects, the cost of which is not in excess of \$5,000."

SEC. 512. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) housing units leased, utilizing available operation and maintenance appropriations, for terms of 1 year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than 5 years pursuant to the provisions of section 417 of the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1018)."

SEC. 513. (a) Notwithstanding the authorizations for the construction of family housing contained in subsections 104 (a), 204 (a), and 304 (a) of this act, the total number of units of family housing constructed during fiscal year 1959 pursuant to the authority contained in such subsections shall not exceed a total of 4,000 units. The Secretary of Defense shall determine the total number of units to be constructed by each of the military services in conformity with the provisions of this subsection.

(b) Notwithstanding the authorizations for the construction of family housing contained in subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b) of this act, the total number of units of family housing constructed during fiscal year 1959 pursuant to the authority contained in such subsections shall not exceed a total of 30,000 units. The Secretary of Defense shall determine the total number of units to be constructed by each of the military services in conformity with the provisions of this subsection. The Secretaries of the three military departments, or the designee of each, shall promptly notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives of any determination made hereunder as it affects each such department.

(c) To the extent that any of the authorizations contained in subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b) of this act to construct housing at locations specified therein are not utilized, such authorizations may be exercised to construct housing at other locations, except that (1) the total number of housing units to be constructed under the authority of this subsection by any service shall not exceed 10 percent of the total number of units authorized to be constructed by that service under subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), or 304 (b), as the case may be, and (2) the total number of units constructed by the three services pursuant to this authority shall not, when added to the total number of units constructed pursuant to the authority contained in subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b), exceed the total number of units authorized to be constructed by subsection (b) hereof.

(d) (1) Section 404 (c) of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) (1) Condemnation proceedings instituted pursuant to this section shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 357; 40 U. S. C. 257), as amended, or any other

applicable Federal statute. Before any such condemnation proceedings are instituted, an effort shall be made to acquire the property involved by negotiation. In any such condemnation proceedings, and in the interests of expedition, the issue of just compensation shall be determined by a commission of three qualified, disinterested persons to be appointed by the court. Any commission appointed hereunder shall give full consideration to all elements of value in accordance with existing law, and shall have the powers of a master provided in subdivision (c) of rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and proceedings before it shall be governed by the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (d) of such rule. Its action and report shall be determined by a majority and its findings and report shall have the effect, and be dealt with by the court in accordance with the practice prescribed in paragraph (2) of subdivision (e) of such rule. Trial of all issues, other than just compensation, shall be by the court.

"(2) In any condemnation proceedings instituted pursuant to this section, the court shall not order the party in possession to surrender possession in advance of final judgment unless a declaration of taking has been filed, and a deposit of the amount estimated to be just compensation has been made, under the first section of the act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421), providing for such declarations. Unless title is in dispute, the court, upon application, shall promptly pay to the owner at least 75 percent of the amount so deposited, but such payment shall be made without prejudice to any party to the proceeding. In the event that condemnation proceedings are instituted in accordance with procedures under such act of February 26, 1931, the court shall order that the amount deposited shall be paid in a lump sum or over a period not exceeding five years in accordance with stipulations executed by the parties in the proceedings. In connection with condemnation proceedings which do not utilize the procedures under such act, the Secretary or his designee, after final judgment of the court, may pay or agree to pay in a lump sum or, in accordance with stipulations executed by the parties to the proceedings, over a period not exceeding 5 years the difference between the outstanding principal obligation, plus accrued interest, and the price for the property fixed by the court. Unless such payment is made in a lump sum, the unpaid balance thereof shall bear interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum."

(2) The amendment made by this subsection shall be applicable to any condemnation proceedings instituted pursuant to section 404 of the housing amendments of 1955 subsequent to the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 514. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States at a unit cost in excess of—

- (1) \$32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;
- (2) \$6 per square foot for regular warehousing;
- (3) \$1,850 per man for permanent barracks;
- (4) \$8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 515. Titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1958."

SEC. 516. Section 407 (e) of Public Law 85-241, approved August 30, 1957, is amended

by striking out "July 1, 1960," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1 1962."

TITLE VI

Reserve forces facilities

SEC. 601. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) That part of section 2233 (a) that precedes clause (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2233. Acquisition

"(a) Subject to sections 2233a, 2234, 2235, 2236, and 2238 of this title and subsection (c) of this section, the Secretary of Defense may—"

(2) Section 2233 is amended by adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

"(e) The Secretary of Defense may procure advance planning, construction design, and architectural services in connection with facilities to be established or developed under this chapter which are not otherwise authorized by law.

"(f) Facilities authorized by subsection (a) shall not be considered 'military public works' under the provisions of the military construction authorization acts that repeal prior authorizations for military public works."

(3) The following new section is inserted after section 2233:

"§ 2233a. Limitation

"No expenditure or contribution that is more than \$50,000 may be made under section 2233 of this title for any facility that has not been authorized by a law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces. This requirement does not apply to the following:

"(a) Facilities acquired by lease.

"(b) Facilities acquired, constructed, expanded, rehabilitated, converted, or equipped to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed, where the Senate and the House of Representatives have been notified of that action."

(4) The analysis of chapter 133 is amended by inserting the following new item:

"2233a. Limitation."

SEC. 602. (a) Section 3 of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended by paragraph (a) of the act of August 9, 1955, chapter 662 (69 Stat. 593), and by section 2 of the act of August 29, 1957, Public Law 85-215 (71 Stat. 489), is amended by striking out the words "in an amount not to exceed \$580 million over a period of the next 8 fiscal years commencing with fiscal year 1951,".

(b) Section 3 (a) of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended by section 414 of the act of August 3, 1956, chapter 939 (70 Stat. 1018), is amended by striking out the words "and without regard to the monetary limitation otherwise imposed by this section."

SEC. 603. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

(1) For Department of the Navy:

Naval Reserve (aviation)

Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Ga.: Training facilities, \$480,000.

Naval Air Station, Dallas, Tex.: Supply facilities and utilities, \$259,000.

Naval Air Station, Denver, Colo.: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$652,000.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Ill.: Navigational aids and utilities, \$179,000.

Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Mich.: Airfield lighting, \$147,000.

Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, liquid fueling and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting, and land acquisition, \$1,992,000.

Naval Air Station, New Orleans (Alvin Calender Field), La.: Administrative facilities, community facilities, navigational aids, operational facilities, supply facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,447,000.

Naval Air Station, New York, N. Y.: Airfield lighting, \$130,000.

Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$652,000.

Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, \$570,000.

Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Mass.: Utilities, \$407,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pa.: Utilities, \$99,000.

Naval Reserve (surface)

Alameda, Calif.: Waterfront operational facilities, \$128,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Bloomington, Ind.: Training facilities, \$95,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Boston, Mass.: Training facilities, \$108,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Centennial, Wash.: Training facilities, \$81,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Chillicothe, Ohio: Training facilities, \$100,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Danville, Ky.: Training facilities, \$84,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Dunkirk, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$79,000.

Fort Schuyler, N. Y.: Waterfront operational facilities, \$120,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Hayward, Calif.: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$99,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Honolulu, Hawaii: Training facilities, \$515,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Iowa City, Iowa: Training facilities, \$97,000.

Master Control Radio Station, New Orleans, La.: Communications, \$210,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Olympia (Tumwater), Wash.: Training facilities, \$47,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Pasadena, Calif.: Training facilities, \$132,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Port Chicago, Calif.: Training facilities, \$94,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Jose, Calif.: Land acquisition, \$78,000.

Saint Petersburg, Fla.: Waterfront operational facilities, \$26,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Steubenville, Ohio: Land acquisition, \$18,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, White Oak (Lewiston), Md.: Training facilities, \$557,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Yakima, Wash.: Training facilities, \$48,000.

Marine Corps Reserve (Ground)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Lynchburg, Va.: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$388,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Memphis, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$453,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Moline, Ill.: Training facilities, \$152,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Pasadena, Calif.: Training facilities, \$163,000.

(2) For Department of the Air Force:

Air Force Reserve

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Md.: Operational and training facilities, \$129,000.

Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Ind.: Operational and training facilities, utilities

and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$3,174,000.

Bates Field, Mobile, Ala.: Maintenance facility, \$97,000.

Bradley Field, Windsor Locks, Conn.: Maintenance facility and utilities and ground improvements, \$160,000.

Davis Field, Muskogee, Okla.: Maintenance facility, and supply facility, \$325,000.

General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wis.: Maintenance facility, and operational and training facilities, \$173,000.

Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, N. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$180,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Belton, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, \$101,000.

Naval Air Station (Alvin Callender Field), Orleans Parish, La.: Operational and training facilities, \$622,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pa.: Maintenance facility, \$93,000.

Air National Guard of the United States

Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, and hospital and medical facilities, \$171,000.

Barnes Field, Westfield, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, \$740,000.

Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel, Minn.: Site improvements, \$500,000.

Birmingham Municipal Airport, Birmingham, Ala.: Operational and training facilities, \$150,000.

Byrd Field, Richmond, Va.: Supply facilities, \$50,000.

Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wis.: Operational and training facilities, \$579,000.

Capital Airport, Springfield, Ill.: Supply facilities, \$78,000.

Des Moines Municipal Airport, Des Moines, Iowa.: Operational and training facilities, \$53,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,308,000.

Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, N. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$170,000.

Gulfport Municipal Airport, Gulfport, Miss.: Supply facilities, \$362,000.

Hayward Municipal Airport, Hayward, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$113,000.

Hensley Field, Grand Prairie, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,862,000.

Hubbard Field, Reno, Nev.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$159,000.

Kellogg Field, Battle Creek, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,136,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$570,000.

Martinsburg Municipal Airport, Martinsburg, W. Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$123,000.

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Ill.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,099,000.

Ontario International Airport, Ontario, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$127,000.

Portland Municipal Airport, Portland, Oreg.: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, \$233,000.

Rosecrans Field, St. Joseph, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$123,000.

San Juan International Airport, San Juan, P. R.: Supply facilities, \$70,000.

Sky Harbor Airport, Phoenix, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, \$655,000.

Standiford Field, Louisville, Ky.: Operational and training facilities, and administrative facilities, \$715,000.

Theodore F. Green Airport, Providence, R. I.: Operational and training facilities, \$213,000.

Travis Field, Savannah, Ga.: Housing, supply facilities and utilities, \$317,000.

Various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, \$300,000.

(3) For Department of the Army:

Army Reserve

Batavia, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$171,000.

Beckley, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$289,000.

Beloit, Wis.: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Canandaigua, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$171,000.

Canton, Ohio: Training facilities, \$40,000.

Cheyenne, Wyo.: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Durant, Okla.: Training facilities, \$141,000.

Fargo, N. Dak.: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Fremont, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Galesburg, Ill.: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Greenwood, S. C.: Training facilities, \$85,000.

Hempstead, N. Y. (Nr2): Training facilities, \$536,000.

Johnstown, Pa.: Training facilities, \$99,000.

Kewaunee, Wis.: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Madison, Wis.: (Nr2): Training facilities, \$490,000.

Oklahoma City, Okla. (Nr2): Training facilities, \$443,000.

St. Marys, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.

St. Marys, Pa.: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Salinas, Calif.: Training facilities, \$164,000.

Sinton, Tex.: Training facilities, \$134,000.

Stockton, Calif.: Training facilities, \$164,000.

Warren, Ohio: Training facilities, \$289,000.

Weirton, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$149,000.

San Jose, Calif.: Road improvements, \$32,000.

Land acquisition: Training facilities, \$419,000.

Army National Guard of the United States (armory)

Ackerman, Miss.: Training facilities, \$54,000.

Agawam, Mass.: Training facilities, \$210,000.

Amarillo, Tex.: Training facilities, \$231,000.

Asheville, N. C.: Training facilities, \$132,000.

Ashford, Ala.: Training facilities, \$70,000.

Atlanta, Ga.: Training facilities, \$132,000.

Batesburg, S. C.: Training facilities, \$99,000.

Batesville, Miss.: Training facilities, \$54,000.

Beckley, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$200,000.

Belfast, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.

Belmont, N. C.: Training facilities, \$98,000.

Belton, S. C.: Training facilities, \$122,000.

Belton, Tex.: Training facilities, \$86,000.

Berryville, Ark.: Training facilities, \$45,000.

Berryville, Va.: Training facilities, \$135,000.

Bethel, Alaska: Training facilities, \$480,000.

Bethlehem, Pa.: Training facilities, \$45,000.

Boston, Mass.: Training facilities, \$270,000.

Bridgeport, Ala.: Training facilities, \$70,000.

Brunswick, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.

Caldwell, Ohio: Training facilities, \$135,000.

Calhoun, Ga.: Training facilities, \$110,000.

Camden, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.

Carlisle, Pa.: Training facilities, \$45,000.

Catskill, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$300,000.

Chesterfield, S. C.: Training facilities, \$99,000.

Chester, Pa.: Training facilities, \$206,000.

Cincinnati, Ohio: Training facilities, \$300,000.

Clarksburg, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$189,000.

Clayton, N. Mex.: Training facilities, \$57,000.

Clover, S. C.: Training facilities, \$99,000.

Cody, Wyo.: Training facilities, \$142,000.

Concord, N. H.: Training facilities, \$375,000.

Crossville, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.

Cuero, Tex.: Training facilities, \$93,000.

Culver City, Calif.: Training facilities, \$38,000.

Dallas No. 5, Tex.: Training facilities, \$154,000.

Dayton, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.

Duluth, Minn.: Training facilities, \$37,000.

Eaton, Ga.: Training facilities, \$90,000.

Edna, Tex.: Training facilities, \$93,000.

Ei Campo, Tex.: Training facilities, \$104,000.

Espanola, N. Mex.: Training facilities, \$57,000.

Fairbanks, Alaska: Training facilities, \$277,000.

Farmville, N. C.: Training facilities, \$98,000.

Fontana, Calif.: Training facilities, \$105,000.

Franklin, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.

Fredericktown, Mo.: Training facilities, \$135,000.

Gainesville, Fla.: Training facilities, \$120,000.

Gainesville, Tex.: Training facilities, \$111,000.

Gardiner, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.

Gassaway, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$189,000.

Greensboro, N. C.: Training facilities, \$357,000.

Greenville, Ohio: Training facilities, \$165,000.

Hammonton, N. J.: Training facilities, \$175,000.

Harriman, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.

Hendersonville, N. C.: Training facilities, \$120,000.

Hollister, Calif.: Training facilities, \$105,000.

Honey Grove, Tex.: Training facilities, \$90,000.

Houston No. 1, Tex.: Training facilities, \$323,000.

Houston No. 2, Tex.: Training facilities, \$264,000.

Jerome, Idaho: Training facilities, \$52,000.

Johnston, S. C.: Training facilities, \$99,000.

Juncos, P. R.: Training facilities, \$38,000.

Juneau, Alaska: Training facilities, \$450,000.

Kannapolis, N. C.: Training facilities, \$109,000.

Kealakekua, T. H.: Training facilities, \$145,000.

Ketchikan, Alaska: Training facilities, \$277,000.

Keyser, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Kingsport, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$165,000.

Lake City, S. C.: Training facilities, \$99,000.

Lasker-Woodland, N. C.: Training facilities, \$103,000.

Laurinburg, N. C.: Training facilities, \$105,000.

Lincolnton, N. C.: Training facilities, \$95,000.

Ligonier, Pa.: Training facilities, \$45,000.

Little Rock, Ark.: Training facilities, \$260,000.

Livingston, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.

Logan, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$189,000.

Lovell, Wyo.: Training facilities, \$142,000.

Marietta, Ga.: Training facilities, \$90,000.

Mayaguez, P. R.: Training facilities, \$160,000.

Middleboro, Ky.: Training facilities, \$130,000.

Millinocket, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.
 Minneapolis, Minn.: Training facilities, \$88,000.
 Nashville, N. C.: Training facilities, \$98,000.
 New Bern, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 New London, Conn.: Training facilities, \$360,000.
 Norfolk, Va.: Training facilities, \$441,000.
 Northwest St. Paul, Minn.: Training facilities, \$130,000.
 Oak Ridge, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$142,000.
 Ocean Springs, Miss.: Training facilities, \$54,000.
 Pacolet Mills, S. C.: Training facilities, \$99,000.
 Patchogue, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$375,000.
 Persons, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 Phoenix, Ariz.: Training facilities, \$65,000.
 Pitman, N. J.: Training facilities, \$175,000.
 Portland, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.
 Preston, Idaho: Training facilities, \$57,000.
 Princeton, N. J.: Training facilities, \$175,000.
 Pulaski, Va.: Training facilities, \$135,000.
 Quitman, Ga.: Training facilities, \$90,000.
 Reynolds, Ga.: Training facilities, \$90,000.
 Richmond, Va.: Training facilities, \$441,000.
 Rigby, Idaho: Training facilities, \$57,000.
 Rockingham, N. C.: Training facilities, \$98,000.
 Roseboro, N. C.: Training facilities, \$98,000.
 Saco, Maine: \$150,000.
 Salem, N. J.: Training facilities, \$15,000.
 Salem, Oreg.: Training facilities, \$161,000.
 Salcm, S. Dak.: Training facilities, \$150,000.
 San Fernando, Calif.: Training facilities, \$115,000.
 San Rafael (Fairfax), Calif.: Training facilities, \$115,000.
 Saranac Lake, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$300,000.
 Saugus, Mass.: Training facilities, \$210,000.
 Shallotte, N. C.: Training facilities, \$95,000.
 Silver City, N. Mex.: Training facilities, \$57,000.
 Sitka, Alaska: Training facilities, \$45,000.
 Smithfield, N. C.: Training facilities, \$98,000.
 Smithtown, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$300,000.
 Socorro, N. Mex.: Training facilities, \$57,000.
 South Boston, Mass.: Training facilities, \$360,000.
 South Pittsburg, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 South Portland, Maine: Training facilities, \$150,000.
 Saint George, S. C.: Training facilities, \$99,000.
 Stillwater, Minn.: Training facilities, \$37,000.
 Storm Lake, Iowa: Training facilities, \$95,000.
 Sturgis, Mich.: Training facilities, \$220,000.
 Swanton, Vt.: Training facilities, \$137,000.
 Tell City, Ind.: Training facilities, \$188,000.
 Texarkana, Tex.: Training facilities, \$153,000.
 Twin Falls, Idaho: Training facilities, \$90,000.
 Valparaiso, Ind.: Training facilities, \$188,000.
 Ventura, Calif.: Training facilities, \$115,000.
 Wahoo, Ncbr.: Training facilities, \$115,000.
 Wallace, N. C.: Training facilities, \$95,000.
 Waverly, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 Waynesboro, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 Weston, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$189,000.

Whitman, Mass.: Training facilities, \$210,000.
 Whitmire, S. C.: Training facilities, \$99,000.
 Winnemucca, Nev.: Training facilities, \$110,000.
 Yates Center, Kans.: Training facilities, \$93,000.
 Yuma, Ariz.: Training facilities, \$45,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES
 (NONARMORY)

Anchorage, Alaska: Administrative and supply facilities, \$192,000.
 Augusta, Maine: Administrative and supply facilities, \$190,000.
 Burlington, Vt.: Administrative and supply facilities, \$208,000.
 Camp Beauregard, La.: Administrative and supply facilities, \$325,000.
 Camp Beauregard, La.: Maintenance facilities, \$279,000.
 Camp Butner, N. C.: Supply facilities, \$353,000.
 Camp Dodge, Iowa: Maintenance facilities, \$80,000.
 Camp Dodge, Iowa: Supply facilities, \$120,000.
 Camp Shelby, Miss.: Maintenance facilities, \$165,000.
 Columbia, S. C.: Maintenance facilities, \$80,000.
 Concord, N. H.: Administrative and supply facilities, \$145,000.
 Culbertson, Mont.: Maintenance facilities, \$73,000.
 Jefferson City, Mo.: Administrative and supply facilities, \$113,000.
 Kalispell, Mont.: Maintenance facilities, \$67,000.
 Nashville, Tenn.: Administrative and supply facilities, \$493,000.
 Salt Lake City, Utah: Maintenance facilities, \$235,000.
 Trenton, N. J.: Supply facilities, \$80,000.

(4) For all Reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to Reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for Reserves forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection.

SEC. 604. The first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, does not apply to—

(a) facilities that—
 (1) have been the subject of consultation with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives before July 1, 1958;
 (2) are under contract before July 1, 1960; and
 (3) are funded from appropriations made before the date of enactment of this act; or

(b) facilities that are authorized by section 603 (4) of this act; or

(c) The following facilities for the Air National Guard of the United States:

(1) Milford Point, Conn.: Operation and training facilities, \$337,000.

(2) Wellesley, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, \$319,000.

(3) Westchester County Airport, White Plains, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, \$105,000.

SEC. 605. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and section 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for

surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 606. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 603 for the respective Reserve components of the Armed Forces may not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$11,886,000.

(2) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air Force Reserve, \$5,054,000;

(b) Air National Guard of the United States, \$11,976,000.

(3) for Department of the Army: Army Reserve and Army National Guard of the United States, \$28,330,000.

SEC. 607. (a) Any of the amounts named in section 603 of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 percent, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses 1, 2 (a), 2 (b), and 3 of section 606 respectively.

(b) The Secretary of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, establish or develop facilities for Reserve forces other than those facilities authorized by section 603 of this act, except that (1) the total cost of such facilities by any service shall not exceed 10 percent of the total amount authorized to be expended by that service for projects under such section, and (2) the total cost for all projects established or developed by any service under the authority of this subsection shall not, when added to the total cost of the projects established or developed by such service under the authority of section 603, exceed the amounts prescribed by clauses 1, 2 (a), 2 (b), 3, of section 606, respectively.

SEC. 608. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1958."

Passed the House of Representatives July 10, 1958.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
 Clerk.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senate is considering the so-called military construction bill. It is a military construction program at home and abroad for all three services. The copies of the hearings are on the desks of Senators, together with the committee report. I have a fairly brief speech and analysis of the bill which I should like to put in the RECORD. I would appreciate being able to make my remarks without interruption, so far as possible, because there is a certain continuity to them. Of course, if a Senator has a pressing engagement elsewhere, I shall be glad to yield to him; otherwise I ask that I be permitted to make my remarks without interruption.

Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to authorize construction for the military departments within and outside the United States in the total amount of \$2,599,562,000, broken down as follows:

New authorizations for the active forces, \$1,644,641,000.

Additions to prior year authorizations, \$64,455,000.

New authorizations for the Reserve components—Organized Reserve and National Guard—\$57,246,000.

In addition, the \$2,599,000,000 figure includes authorizations to construct approximately \$833 million of title VIII—Capehart—family housing units.

I might say at this point, that while the title VIII housing is not normally considered a budget item, nevertheless the units must be paid for and this bill cannot properly be evaluated unless the housing costs are considered—for once approved and made part of law—they represent a charge against the taxpayer as legitimate as any outright authorization.

These houses are not built with appropriated funds, and therefore do not show up in the budget. However, the contingent liability imposed by the bill, if they are constructed, is as outlined.

The approximately \$1,645 million in new authorizations is divided between the three services as follows: Army, \$201,963,000; Navy, \$323,887,000; Air Force, \$885,390,000.

In addition, the Department of Defense would be authorized \$233,406,000.

Mr. President, the figures I have mentioned represent a total slightly under \$600 million less than that originally requested by Department of Defense. A comparison of the final committee actions and recommendations is shown on page 10 of the report.

There are several things unusual about the bill being reported this year. For instance, for the first time it includes construction authorizations for both the active and Reserve forces. Second, there appears for the first time the total construction authorization requests including contingent liabilities for housing mentioned previously.

This year during the hearings and review of the construction bill, the committee intentionally placed greater emphasis on the major policy areas which in themselves create the forces that require the facilities. This does not mean that full consideration was not given to each specific line item—of which there were approximately 3,000. Based upon past experience, it has become obvious to the committee that the very act of authorizing bases from which military operations may be conducted cannot be divorced from the broader field of policy. It is apparent that Congress cannot avoid making policy decisions when it considers and passes this type of legislation. Construction bills not only concern themselves with brick and mortar, but by their very nature they also support ballistic missile programs, continental air defense weapons systems, overseas bases, and, in fact, almost every category of our military program.

As was the case last year, the committee established a standard criteria against which all service requests were compared. This criteria is shown commencing on page 5 of the report.

I should like to say with some emphasis that the report filed with the bill, consisting of 121 pages, is a review of many of the major active military policies

which are supported by the bill, and contains a great deal of factual information gathered not only during the hearings this year, but over the past several years as well. I believe the report will be a valuable contribution to the file of every Senator who would like to have a handbook which covers at least a part of our active military program.

It will be impossible to review here today each of the several thousand line items contained in the bill; however, the unclassified record of hearings is available and indexed.

I shall, therefore, address myself initially to the basic policy questions involved and the reasons behind the committee's actions in these areas. Following, I shall be glad to attempt to answer any questions which my colleagues may have.

During its review of the bill, the committee concluded that the fiscal year 1959 construction program represented one of the best thought-out programs received. It was quite apparent that defense had applied standard procedures and that the greater part of the operational and supporting items were essential to the better functioning of the Defense Establishment.

If it had not been for the fact that the bill as presented involved certain underlying policy matters, it would have been possible for the committee to approve the bill with very few changes.

As previously stated, the committee, while thoroughly reviewing the many line items, directed its attention primarily to major policy areas. As a result some of the conclusions reached resulted in a definite impact on certain areas—which had they been considered in the light of construction criteria only, would have occasioned little or no concern.

While the purely technical review procedures developed by defense have improved in a most satisfactory manner, there remains one area of transcending importance where adequate coordination, or even decisions, is apparently lacking. This situation caused to be suspect some of the construction items in the bill.

I refer to the basic need for a coordinated and concurrent development of the construction program in the light of approved national policies—and in support of approved and unified long range plans—required by these approved national policies. Such is essential in order to insure that—

First. True operational requirements are given priority over marginal ones.

Second. Locations selected for key strategic installations are consistent with operational needs, vulnerability studies, and not on purely fiscal ones.

Third. Facilities for new weapons systems are constructed in time to meet the planned operational and deployment dates of these new weapons.

Fourth. Decisions are made between duplicating weapons systems prior to the request that duplicating facilities be constructed.

Fifth. Additional facilities are not constructed for antiquated weapons systems or soon to be outdated ones—when proper coordination with long range

planning in light of new developments would eliminate such.

Sixth. Housing and other personnel facilities are constructed on the most economical basis, and in direct relation to the requirements of known and approved long range troop basis.

Seventh. Fiscal decisions alone are not allowed to determine military capabilities once the military program has been approved in light of approved national policy.

Eighth. Facilities are constructed at overseas bases on an austere basis to meet operational requirements only, and in full consideration of the realities of the international political and diplomatic climate.

Ninth. Continuous supervision by qualified personnel of military construction projects to insure adherence to the principles of competitive bid and minimum costs to the Government.

Tenth. Full consideration is given to the possible impact of the military construction program on our Nation's economy both now and in the future.

FINAL COMMITTEE ACTION

As I have mentioned before, page 10 of the report outlines the major dollar differences from the original proposal and that recommended by the committee. As a result of its deliberations, these differences are prompted by an expected reduction of approximately \$40 million in new authorizations; a reduction of better than \$550 million in the contingent liability pertaining to title VIII family housing—and a limitation on the number of units to be constructed during fiscal year 1959. In addition, to the Reserve component—including Army National Guard—in the amount of approximately \$28 million.

I should like to emphasize at this point that nothing in the report or my remarks should be interpreted to mean that the committee lacks faith in the Department of Defense or the three services. On the contrary, the military and civilian personnel in the departments responsible for the construction program have evidenced, as usual, a commendable knowledge and supervision of the subject. The committee does feel, however, that as in all complex human endeavors, there is room here for improvement. This is a field which requires understanding and cooperation between all branches of the Government. Therefore, the committee's actions and recommendations, while quite critical of certain areas, are made with constructive intent and none other.

UNITED STATES MILITARY POLICY

In an effort to provide a suitable background for reviewing the construction requirements, the committee attempted to analyze the United States military policy upon which our force structures are based. Predicated upon the various statements as enunciated by senior Defense officials before this committee, during the past several years and focalized during our hearings this year, it can be broadly stated that the military policy of the United States consists of 4 basic interrelated and mutually supporting con-

cepts. It was quite obvious to the committee that all military personnel and senior civilian officials of the Department do not agree with each other as to the relative importance of these 4 areas. In fact, each service seems to place its own unilateral measurement upon each one. Nevertheless, it became clear to the committee that the prime concepts upon which the services are basing their requirements for forces are:

First. Warning—because the enemy can be expected to move first.

Second. Retaliation — an offensive strike capability second to none in the event of an enemy attack.

Third. Defense—either 100 percent or sufficient to deter attack and protect retaliation forces.

Fourth. Limited war capability—that capability sufficient to handle "brush fires" or to move strategically in sufficient time and with adequate force to avoid the loss of vital strategic areas and if possible to prevent the outbreak of general war.

This bill contains authorizations designed to meet certain construction requirements relative to the above. Obviously a single bill cannot satisfy all of these requirements. While certain specific details are classified, it is possible to discuss many of the salient ones.

WARNING CONCEPT

All witnesses appeared convinced that we must establish and maintain the best possible warning system; otherwise the adherence to a policy of nonaggression could prove fatal especially in a climate where reaction time is at a premium.

The committee emphatically concurs in this concept. The warning systems must be attuned, however, not only to the military requirements of threat from manned bombers, ballistic missiles, and so forth, but also to international diplomatic and political threats.

I shall not attempt here to go into all the details of the warning system; the report covers it quite thoroughly, we believe, beginning on page 11.

RETALIATION CONCEPT

On page 14 of the report will be found descriptions of that portion of the bill pertaining to the Strategic Air Command, our principal element of retaliation forces. SAC tanker relocation, alert facilities, and on page 16 ballistic missiles are covered.

The bill would provide approximately \$200 million in construction authorizations for SAC; \$33 million for SAC tanker relocation; \$80 million for alert facilities, and \$165.9 million for ballistic missile facilities. This latest figure includes authorization for the construction of operational Atlas facilities at one location not yet firmly selected, and support facilities for both the previously programmed Atlas sites. It also includes authorization for the construction of hardened facilities for the Titan ICBM along with operational facilities and training facilities for the ICBM and the IRBM at Cooke Air Force Base, Calif.

There are, of course, other missile authorizations contained in the bill; most of these subjects of necessity are of a classified nature. For instance, certain authorizations are included in the bill

for the construction of Polaris facilities and the details are classified. According to testimony, this Navy missile gives promise of becoming perhaps one of the most decisive weapons of warfare. It is the view of the committee that Defense could well expedite this program. The committee hopes that the Department of Defense will continue to provide the Navy with the highest priority in the development of Polaris, and remove any obstacles which might prevent an early operational readiness date.

DEFENSE CONCEPT

Most weapons systems can rightly be cataloged in certain of their applications as supporting defense. The committee, in its report, directs itself only to those which pertain to the continental air defense field. This description begins on page 17 of the report.

The defense system includes SAGE, flight interceptors, surface-to-air missiles, personnel and supporting facilities. It is evidenced by the Nike family, Bomarc, and Hawk.

DUPLICATION OF AIR DEFENSE WEAPONS SYSTEMS

The report contains a very serious observation by the committee with reference to the continental defense system.

The committee is, and has been for some time, greatly concerned over the possible duplication of weapons systems and their attendant excessive cost and waste of effort.

We now have deployed or soon to be deployed, throughout the continental United States, at least four systems superimposed upon each other and blanketing the entire continent. While each system has its own special characteristics, testimony indicated there is an overlapping where one system might well perform the functions of its neighbor. Each of these systems is estimated to cost from \$3 billion to \$6 billion, individually.

Testimony taken indicated that while the Joint Chiefs of Staff or the Office, Secretary of Defense has not given official approval to all contemplated programs, nevertheless if those being contemplated by each service were to be established in their entirety, the total cost would be in the neighborhood of \$8 billion a year for the next 5 years, and that the operational cost would be \$5 billion annually, thereafter.

Secretary McElroy has stated "the capital investment already made in this continental air defense during the last 4½ years exceeds \$13 million. The cost of operation is now almost \$2 billion." Information in the committee files indicated that Secretary McElroy's figure may be on the low side.

It is the committee's unanimous opinion that decision must be made to eliminate duplication or the annual budget must be increased beyond all reasonable proportions.

Secretary of Defense McElroy indicated his thoughts concerning future defense budgets as shown in the following excerpts from the published record of his press conference held on June 19, 1958, at Quantico, Va.:

Mr. NORRIS (Washington Post). Could you indicate what size that budget is? There

have been some reports that it would go up tremendously.

Secretary McELROY. Well, there has been no approval of the budget by the administration as a whole.

Mr. NORRIS. I meant the future trend.

Secretary McELROY. Well, you mean how high it could ultimately—

Mr. NORRIS. There have been reports that it would go up to 60 or 70 billion within a decade if you continued with the size of forces and all the programs.

Secretary McELROY. I think that could well be.

Mr. NORRIS. You think that could be?

Secretary McELROY. Yes; I do.

Mr. NORRIS. Does that—does the study show that?

Secretary McELROY. No; we haven't gone that far. In fact, I don't think there is much use really in making a projection for 10 years ahead with technological advances proceeding as they do. That figure of 60 to 70, is in my opinion, a pretty breezy figure, but I can tell you that it wouldn't be difficult for that kind of addition to have to be required if we continue with the size forces we have.

Of course, Secretary McElroy was referring to the size of the forces, the personnel, and other aspects of the entire defense program.

The committee feels that major policy decisions must be immediately made in order to establish just how far the country is to go in developing fixed defenses.

NIKE-TALOS

Two years ago, in the fiscal year 1957 military construction authorization bill, the committee was presented with requests for authorizations pertaining to construction of facilities for Nike-Ajax and Talos ground-to-air missiles. The Ajax was to be used in connection with the Army's point defense responsibilities, and the Talos was part of the Air Force area defense mission. At that time, the committee in its report, stated:

The committee concluded that both the Army and the Air Force are assigned overlapping roles and missions in the anti-aircraft and continental air defense fields. While the Air Force views its mission as one of area defense, and the Army views its as perimeter or point defense, it is clear that a definite and urgent need exists for the Department of Defense to quickly and positively clarify the specific responsibility of each service. The committee believes that unless concise responsibilities are assigned, duplication of weapons systems costing in the multi-billion-dollar range might result, and that such duplication would obviously be too costly as well as inexcusable from the military standpoint.

The committee then denied the authorization for the establishment of Talos sites, and called upon the Secretary of Defense to make a determination. Subsequently, in his memorandum of November 26, 1956, the Secretary of Defense assigned Talos to the Department of the Army.

The committee took the action of denying the authorization for Talos, not because it believed that Talos was an ineffective weapon; on the contrary, testimony indicated that it gave promise of being ideally suited for a role in the air defense system. The committee felt then, as it does now, that Congress should not be called upon to make a determination between the relative merits of weapons systems, each of which was

strongly supported by its developers; that this was a responsibility that should be accepted by the Department of Defense.

In May 1958, the chairman of the committee received the following letter from the Department of the Army with reference to the future production of Talos:

MAY 2, 1958.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In conformance with the Department of the Army's policy to keep you and the members of your committee informed of Army affairs, it is desired to acquaint you with actions being taken concerning the land-based Talos missile.

Based on the review and decision of higher authority not to employ the land-based Talos system due to budgetary limitations, it became necessary for the Army to terminate the Talos production contract with RCA yesterday, May 1, 1958.

While this action results in termination of the manufacture of Talos land-based systems, the production of certain components, basically computers and tracking radars, will be continued for utilization in the research and development areas on other Army programs.

Remaining in effect between RCA and the Army is the contract to complete evaluation of the Talos land-based system. This evaluation is being performed on the research and development model installed at White Sands Proving Ground.

Sincerely,

J. H. MICHAELIS,
Major General, GS,
Chief of Legislative Liaison.

Even though qualified witnesses who appeared before the committee had stated that "Talos ranks with the best in air defense systems. This country needs all it can buy," the decision has now been reached that Talos is no longer required. Yet, had the committee authorized the funds requested in the fiscal year 1957 military construction authorization bill, there can be no doubt that Talos sites would now be established adjacent to Nike-Ajax installations.

In review, Mr. President, the committee struck from the bill the provisions for the sites of the Talos missile and called upon the Secretary of Defense to reconsider the matter and to make a choice.

In the course of time the choice was made. The Talos missile was turned over to the Army, and thereafter was discontinued. We have not received any more requests for construction authorizations in that connection. If there had been an authorization of the sites, as well as the funds, we believe that program would have continued, and we would now have, side by side, programs which now have been decided to be duplications.

A similar situation apparently exists today with regard to Nike-Hercules and Bomarc. The same arguments exist regarding point and area defense. A glance at the classified deployments projected for these missiles indicates that in many, many instances it is planned to locate each in the same area, for the purpose of defending the same installation. The committee has reviewed this subject most thoroughly—not only at this session, but also during the 2 preceding years. Each service has de-

fended its own program with honest vigor and conviction. Yet it is most obvious to the committee that the Army and the Air Force continue to have overlapping responsibilities in the air defense missile field, and that their respective programs duplicate each other.

DEFENSE VERSUS OFFENSE

Some have argued that we can never have enough defense. The committee is of the opinion that the best defense is still a strong offense. Too great a defensive psychology can only result in a "Maginot line" concept. Obviously we must provide adequate defense for our strike or retaliatory forces, but we must establish our true defense or mobility, dispersal, striking power, and more important, diplomatic and military policies designed to prevent war; such cannot be divorced from economic stability.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The committee, therefore, recommends the following action, and the bill as reported reflects this recommendation: The committee deleted \$137 million from the Army title pertaining to Nike-Hercules, Hawk, and Missile Master; and \$92 million of the Air Force title pertaining to Bomarc, and added \$183 million to title IV. This action has a result of reducing the combined total requested for Nike-Hercules, and so forth, and Bomarc by 20 percent, and authorizing the Secretary of Defense or his designee to construct such defense missile sites as he deems essential for security. The 20 percent reduction is made on the basis that it seems reasonable to assume that immediate and tangible savings would be effected if a decision is made.

In taking this action, the committee does not attempt to set itself up as military experts. These are decisions which must be made by the Secretary of Defense supported by qualified technicians. The committee took this action as a matter of focusing the problem and in underlining its belief that the Congress should not be called upon to determine the merits of competing weapons systems.

Here, also, I should like to emphasize that the committee is not establishing the precedent of making all authorizations or appropriations directly to the Secretary of Defense. On the contrary, it is simply carrying out the prerogatives of Congress relative to its right to authorize and appropriate in special areas. Nor is this a precedent for denying authorizations and appropriations directly to the services. We believe that the identity of the services should be preserved—but not for the purpose of perpetuating duplication in instances where obviously a decision must be made.

LIMITED WAR CONCEPT

At this point I should like to draw attention to page 29 of the report. I shall not deal further with the subject of limited war, except to say that testimony indicates this is a concept which has not yet received sufficient attention within the Department of Defense. While not part of the actual construction items contained in the bill, I should

like to state here that testimony indicates that the country does not have adequate airlift capability to move its ground combat forces in the event of an emergency. The committee wonders why some of the money spent to date on fixed defense has not been utilized to provide a greater airlift capability. Without mobility, ground forces would have little opportunity of reaching vital areas in sufficient time.

In light of this, the committee cannot help but wonder why the Army has placed such a great emphasis on fixed defense—point—weapons systems, which the committee believes has caused a resulting diminution of the Army's ground combat capability—its principal and most important mission. The committee believes the Army should take stock of itself and shall redirect its efforts toward providing the United States with the finest forces in the world capable of victorious sustained ground combat; such would be consistent with its long and glorious history developed on many famous battlegrounds.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention particularly to pages 29 and 30 of the report, where the matter is taken up at considerable length. Of course it may be debated by other Senators during the further consideration of the bill.

At this point, the committee wishes especially to compliment and commend the United States Marine Corps. All can be proud of the Marine Corps, its tradition, its valor, and its courage. The committee was particularly proud on the day when the Marine Corps witnesses appeared before it. All officials to that date had testified on the need for new weapons systems, better machines of war, and the highly complicated gadgets of modern electronics. A Marine general, in describing the Marines' concept of operations, was the only military man who, at the conclusion of his testimony, said, in substance: "Regardless of our requests for facilities and weapons, I would like to point out that we leave such decisions to the committee, for the individual fighting Marine is our greatest asset, and as long as we can maintain him, we have few problems."

Mr. President, those words came rather refreshingly to the committee, which hears many long, laborious lamentations about so many things which it is alleged the Congress has not done, and which are said to cause the morale of the men in the services to be low. In that connection, we are told that we must do this or must do that, in order to increase the morale.

But that Marine general tells us that, so far as his force is concerned, "You make the decisions; and we will move from there, and it will be up to us to do the rest." I commend very highly that spirit and that attitude.

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

Military family housing is one of the most important aspects of the annual construction program. For the first time this year, we have a bill which provides line items at given locations for the number of family housing units to be constructed.

For the past 3 years, the committee has become increasingly disturbed over the possibility of overproduction of military family housing units. While it cannot be questioned that all military personnel must have adequate housing, nevertheless, in the light of uncertain future strength pertaining to military personnel, it is believed that there are two aspects of the housing program which have not yet been satisfactorily met. First, we are not convinced that the stated objective, i. e., number of houses to be constructed, has been properly coordinated, either numerically or geographically, with long-range defense plans—specifically as these plans affect troop strength. Second, we are convinced that the principal method of procuring military family housing is too costly, and in the long run is economically unsound.

In the last few years we have seen tangible reductions in the troop strength. In June 1954, the total was approximately 3,300,000. Today, it is approximately 2,600,000, with rumors of tangible cuts contemplated for the future.

Originally in this bill, the Department of Defense requested authorizations to construct about 50,000 title VIII housing units; 50,000 units will be a contingent liability over the next 25 to 30 years—or close to \$1,400,000,000.

Therefore, the committee, while authorizing the construction of units requested at specific installations, provided in section 513 of the bill language limiting the number of title VIII family housing units to be constructed in the fiscal year 1959 to a total of 30,000. The committee believes that unless a military family housing program is closely coordinated with, and held safely below, the anticipated long-range troop objectives, the Federal Government may well find itself in the position of attempting to dispose of surplus housing at vacant military installations. The committee remembers too well the case of the title VIII housing program at Fort Polk, La. In that instance, a project of more than \$30 million was canceled, after ground had been broken and construction started—because of troop reductions. Such failure to coordinate coming troop reductions with current construction activities is expected to cost the Government several million dollars—one figure is \$10 million—not counting the unfortunate impact upon the local community.

Mr. President, in regard to the family housing program, to which I have already alluded, we found that requests were made for 50,000 units of family housing, for which the construction cost would, on the average, be \$16,500, exclusive of the interest charges.

By review, we found that in the past 5 years, there have been tangible reductions in the troop strength. For instance, as recently as 1954, the total was approximately 3,300,000, whereas today it is approximately 2,600,000; and there are rumors that further cuts are contemplated for the future.

As I have said, originally in this bill the Department of Defense requested the authorization of 50,000 title VIII hous-

ing units. They would result in a total contingent liability of about \$1,400,000,000. That is the figure I mentioned a while ago as not being included in the budget. It is not carried in the public debt.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Mississippi would like to know that at the present time, in various parts of the country, houses built by the Government during the last 10 years are now being sold for as little as 10 percent of the outstanding mortgage on them and some of them are in close proximity to military installations.

Mr. STENNIS. That is very revealing evidence, and I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to tell the Senator from Mississippi that the General Counsel for the Federal Housing Administration was in my office this morning, and also Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Housing; and they will bear out what I have said—namely, that some of the houses are being sold for less than 10 percent of the amount of the mortgages outstanding on them at the present time. Houses valued at a total of over one million dollars are being sold for \$115,000 in my State. That is one reason why I wish to call this matter to the attention of my colleagues.

Once before, I called it to the attention of the Senate, in the case of houses close to military installations, such as those at Columbia, Charleston, and elsewhere.

The same is happening today.

Certainly the Congress should not throw away the taxpayers' money, when there are 3,000 available houses in Columbia, for example, in close proximity to Fort Jackson, and when the same condition exists in Charleston, S. C., and at other cities.

Such wastes of public funds should be stopped, instead of giving the military more money for the construction of more houses—when so many houses already are available, and are standing empty.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina; he has made a real contribution to the debate.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, although I had requested that I not be interrupted until I had finished the presentation of the major points in connection with the bill. Other Senators have previously requested that I yield, and that has been my reply.

However, if Senators are so pressed for time, in connection with other matters, that it is desirable that I yield to them at this time, certainly I do not wish to be selfish.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, my point is that when millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money is proposed to be spent, I wish to know whether there is a necessity to spend it.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, under the circumstances, I am willing to yield to various Senators at this time.

Mr. BUSH. My question would not have arisen had the Senator from South Carolina not raised the question about the houses being for sale. I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina who is buying these houses. What sort of purchasers are they?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The sales are not even advertised in the towns in which the houses are located. They are advertised in newspapers like the New York Times and in other newspapers in the State, but none were advertised in the counties or cities in which they are located or even in the adjoining counties.

Mr. BUSH. I am sympathetic to the Senator's objection to this kind of procedure. I am glad he has brought the matter before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I did it once before, a couple of years ago, and raised the same question with regard to the building of houses.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, now that the Senator from Mississippi has been interrupted, will he yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, who is a member of the committee, and who has done a great deal of work on the bill. I would appreciate any comment or point he wishes to make.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. First I should like to commend the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is away on official business, for their work on this bill. It has entailed enormous effort. They have given many, many hours to it. The result is, I hope, a very happy one, and one that the Senate and the conferees will adopt.

I should like to ask the Senator two questions. First, I note—and I heard discussion in the committee on the matter—that the Senator has referred to the Secretary of Defense and to certain decisions to be made at the top level. I refer now to pages 89, 107, and 132 of the bill. On those pages, relating to the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, \$25 million is provided to be used according to the decision of the Secretary of Defense. Is that in connection with the remarks the Senator has made about decisions on missiles?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; \$25 million is provided for each of the respective services, to be used for emergency construction. As the committee understands, the \$25 million could be available if the Secretary saw fit to use it on the missile program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And the Committee on Armed Services so provided, on the recommendation of the Senator from Mississippi, in order to try to improve efficiency by having the Secretary of Defense make a decision as to which missile would be used and how it would be used?

Mr. STENNIS. Exactly. We felt the decision should be made by the Secretary. It is not one Congress is capable

of making. The authorization is made for the one who has the responsibility to make the decision. We hope the Secretary will make the decision. The money will then be used as he directs. We have reduced the amount by 20 percent. These are other discretionary funds, available if needed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In that way the committee hopes it will lead to a speedier and more active consideration of which missile is the best and how it can be used?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is there any provision in the bill concerning military demands for construction of space items? I have in mind the majority leader's Committee on Space and Astronautics, which was granted authority in the field of nonmilitary space construction. I should like to know if there is anything in the bill or if the Senator will propose any provision relating to military construction of space items.

Mr. STENNIS. There is a \$50 million authorization, to be used by the Secretary of Defense, in connection with advanced research projects.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is that authorization sufficient, so far as the subcommittee knows, for the current year?

Mr. STENNIS. It is estimated the authorization will be entirely sufficient for the needs that will arise during the current fiscal year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator for his courtesy. I commend him for his work.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. At the outset, let me commend the Senator from Mississippi and his colleagues for the splendid work they have done on this bill. I know it has entailed a tremendous amount of the time for each member of the subcommittee. The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], as well as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee are certainly to be congratulated for what they have done.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARRETT. I wanted to inquire of the Senator about a statement he made a moment ago with regard to the requirement of the sum of \$8 million annually for the construction of aircraft control and warning radar and the items included in that large program over the next 5 years, and \$5 million for operations thereafter, as I recollect the figure. My question is, does that authorization contemplate detection of intercontinental or intermediate range missiles?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. In addition, some of that amount is based on the operations of missiles themselves. It is tied in with part of the detection system, but does not include all the far-flung warning systems beyond the continental United States.

Mr. BARRETT. That was my understanding, but still it seems to me that it is a tremendous sum of money, and it should serve as a warning to the people

that the defense needs of this country and of the free world certainly are going to be increasing tremendously in the years which lie ahead.

Mr. STENNIS. We are satisfied that figure is conservative. It took a long time to arrive at the figure. The amount was arrived at after 2 or 3 years of work.

Mr. BARRETT. On page 13 of the report there is a reference to Sundance Air Force Station at Sundance, Wyo. I should like to ask the Senator if his committee has included an authorization for 25 housing units, at a total cost of \$505,000, as I recollect the figure.

Mr. STENNIS. The details of the installation to which the Senator refers are secret, but the installation was approved, including the housing he specifically mentions. The committee approved the authorization of the housing.

Mr. BARRETT. As the Senator knows, that is an isolated area, away from railroads, and the housing item is badly needed.

Mr. STENNIS. That is one reason why the committee approved that item—because it was an isolated area.

Mr. BARRETT. I now refer to page 16 of the report. The Senator mentioned the fact that there has been an authorization for a classified project, an ICBM installation, at Warren Air Force Base, at Cheyenne, Wyo. Did the committee approve the budget request for this item?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in answer to that question, we approved all of the items requested by the Air Force for the Warren Air Force Base.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator. There is one other item I should like to mention.

On page 113 of the report there is a reference to two Army National Guard units, Lovell and Cody. There is also a reference to the Army Reserve unit at Cheyenne. Those items were requested, I presume, by the Department of Defense.

Mr. STENNIS. Those were approved by the National Guard Bureau and the National Guard Association, which represents the various State National Guard organizations. We have not yet covered that in our presentation to the Senate, but will cover it later. In brief, there were two lists.

Mr. BARRETT. I so understand.

Mr. STENNIS. We approved both. Frankly, we hope the authorization will be granted, and that money will be appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. BARRETT. That was the reason I asked the question, Mr. President. On page 120, in the old list, there appears to be a reference to Laramie and New Castle. The Laramie Armory is presently under construction, but funds have not been appropriated, as yet, for the New Castle work.

Mr. STENNIS. We can assure the Senator that it is our intent that the new list not disturb the old list. The new list is supplemental to the older list. We hope to get funds to cover both of the groups, but that is uncertain. Anyway, there is nothing on the list except those

items approved by the Adjutants General of the various States.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. First, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for what I consider to be a very conscientious and laborious piece of work very effectively and very wisely done.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. Many worked on the hearings and the report.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that, and I realize also what the full responsibility of the chairman of a subcommittee is in matters of this kind. That is the reason I am particularly grateful to the distinguished Senator for the consideration he gave to certain requests for authorization of Rhode Island projects.

I invite the Senator's attention to page 110 of the report. I note items for the naval station, Newport, \$1,709,000; the naval supply depot, Newport, \$2,210,000; the naval war college, Newport, \$273,000; and the Air National Guard, Theodore F. Green Airport, Providence, \$213,000; making a total of \$4,405,000.

I suppose the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is quite familiar with the fact that, with respect to the appropriations bill, the House of Representatives has cut the appropriations for some of these authorizations, which, to me, is a very regrettable fact, because I think it is being pennywise and pound foolish. I assume the distinguished Senator from Mississippi heard the witnesses speak as to the deteriorated condition of some of these establishments, some of which were built after World War I and others built early in World War II. In some instances the roofing is tarpaper.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. That is how archaic some of the buildings are. By their age and inadequacy they tend to destroy the morale of the enlisted personnel who deserve something better from us.

We cannot blame the Navy. The Navy has asked for these facilities in order to house their people decently and to feed them properly. The House of Representatives has cut out the necessary funds even though these projects had been authorized. The same misjudgment was made in an item whose neglect could prove most dangerous to our fleet. This is the steam plant at the Navy depot in Newport, a fuel facility for the Navy. This plant is vital for service to the ships. A niggardly sum of one-third of a million was allotted for repairs. I am happy that the Senate subcommittee has restored the full 2 million.

The breakdowns that these facilities have experienced are as familiar to the people of Newport as is our apparent lack of concern for the well-being of the enlisted personnel who are so often the guests and are always the valued neighbors of the city of Newport.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I heartily agree with every word the Senator has said about some of these facilities.

They not only fail to meet any longer the actual need, but they are demoralizing to the groups using them. In every instance we could, we tried to take care of these situations. These are older installations, and we are trying to rectify present conditions.

Mr. PASTORE. I wish to conclude by saying I expect to appear before the Subcommittee on Appropriations with relation to the restoration of the funds which have been cut. I shall at that time present my case in greater detail. I realize what a potent and strong voice the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has in matters of this kind. I hope for his cooperation and his helpful word at that time.

Mr. STENNIS. On the facts as I recall them now, I think the Senator can certainly depend on whatever I can do to meet the ends he has outlined so very clearly. These authorizations include everything recommended for the Senator's State, in the immediate recommendations. Of course, if this bill should pass, the appropriation bill should be the next step.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had originally intended to wait for the conclusion of the distinguished Senator's remarks, but other Senators have interrupted.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly wish to add my words of commendation of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and the members of his subcommittee, including the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. There is no more diligent and thorough organization connected with the Senate of the United States than this subcommittee, and it is certainly ably assisted by the staff member, Colonel BeLieu, who is assigned to the committee. His thorough knowledge of the workings of the Department of Defense is exceedingly helpful not only to the subcommittee, but to the full Committee on Armed Services.

The subcommittee has done a prodigious job with respect to the military construction authorization bill for fiscal 1959. I commend the statement being made by the Senator from Mississippi and the report of the committee to all Senators who wish to keep abreast of what is transpiring in this field, not only in their own States, but in the United States and abroad. I think if Senators will direct their staffs to take the report home with them, they will have available the answers to a great many questions which might be propounded during the recess of Congress, and thus avoid the necessity of having to call upon the Department of Defense for such information.

As chairman of the full Committee on Armed Services, I have come to rely greatly upon the distinguished Senator

from Mississippi for work of this nature, which requires intelligence, a conscience which has not yet been suppressed by public service, diligence, ability, and willingness to deal with details. As usual, the Senator from Mississippi has done an excellent job, and I am very proud that this bill was handled by a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I certainly thank the chairman of the committee for his most generous remarks to all of us on the subcommittee, including our very fine staff member, Colonel BeLieu, who represents to us the finest traditions of the military service as well as civilian life.

I desire especially to thank the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is away on official business today and could not be present, but who has been very active in the hearings and in the writeup and planning of the entire bill and report.

I especially thank also the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] for his very fine work and effort, as well as for his splendid knowledge and background with reference to the missile program, the SAC program, and, in fact, all military programs.

If I have a blessing in the Senate in this work, it is the fact that I am surrounded by two such stalwart men, with all their energy and fine background.

SURPLUS COMMODITY HOUSING

The bill also contains authority for the construction of certain housing units overseas to be paid for through the Department of Defense surplus commodity procedures. Section 513 of the bill would limit the number to be constructed during fiscal year 1959 to 4,000 for reasons which I shall cover during the discussion of overseas bases. This action does not mean the committee is not in favor of the surplus commodity housing program. On the contrary, it is strongly in favor of the program. Full details of the committee's position are shown in the report commencing on page 35.

I now move on to the recommendation of the committee in connection with the so-called Capehart housing. There were requests for 50,000 units. We prescribed certain criteria. We did not decide at which bases the units should be built, but we did limit the full amount of the authorization to 30,000 units. We feel certain that that is a very generous building program for 1 year's authorization. At least we shall know more a year from now, we hope, about the prospects of the continued size of the services, and the fate of certain bases. This provision is not designed to cancel the program, but to continue it on a more limited scale.

WHERRY HOUSING

I come now to an item of interest, which concerns so-called Wherry housing. I believe Senators are familiar with the program.

This bill, in section 512, exempts the acquisition of permissive Wherry projects and the requirement to report line item authorization in annual con-

struction bills. This, it is believed, is consistent with prior committee recommendations that Department of Defense proceed to acquire all Wherry housing projects for which there is a long-range military requirement at permanent installations.

In addition, section 513 provides for certain clarification in the procedures pertaining to the acquisition of Wherry projects under condemnation.

On behalf of the committee, we have two minor amendments to offer at the proper time, which will further clarify the law in connection with the Wherry acquisition or condemnation proceedings in court. The amendments we shall offer would make it mandatory that the court appoint commissioners, but they will be the court's commissioners, selected by the court itself. We think the commissioner system in these cases will serve better, as a practical matter, than would a jury of 12.

That suggestion came from the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who made a very strong showing with reference to the subject matter. We are glad to offer that amendment on behalf of the committee.

Another suggestion was brought to our attention very vividly and constructively by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. The amendment to be offered in that connection will clarify any obscure language in the bill as it now stands, and make it clear that in the condemnation proceedings the rules of evidence which pertain to a given court or forum will apply to all matters and will be under the control of the judge. The bill does not attempt to prescribe new rules of evidence or to limit the court in applying the law of the particular jurisdiction.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to hear about the amendments which the committee will propose. There are not many types of property like the so-called Wherry housing with respect to which investors have invested their money, and the property is valuable, usually, only for military housing purposes.

Very often the buildings are erected on the property of the Government. The amount of investment, the return, capitalization, and all the other technicalities have to do with the value of property, so I agree that commissioners who can study the technicalities and make the necessary mathematical calculations are the proper group to place a reasonable value on the property—a value that is fair to the owner and fair to the Government.

I have heard some owners of so-called Wherry housing say that in condemnation proceedings under the Department of Justice, among the other elements of value to which the Government has refused to pay any attention have been the replacement cost, and the fair depreciation, which seem to be elements of value which have particular pertinency in connection with Wherry housing.

I had understood that an amendment might be proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in that connection. I certainly hoped that those elements of value which should be considered would be spelled out or considered in connection with this proposed legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. I can answer the Senator from Tennessee in this way: It is the opinion of the committee that when we try to spell out elements of values we create more trouble than we seek to cure. When the parties are unable to negotiate, they enter into a condemnation proceeding, in which rules of evidence and judicial processes control. As I have just said, the rules of evidence of a given forum as to proper elements of value are to be considered. I would strongly oppose any encroachment upon that idea.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In other legislation I have noted that it has not been stated that the items mentioned shall be the only elements of value, but it has been stated that under peculiar circumstances consideration should be given to particular elements of value. That is quite generally done in connection with laws affecting types of property which are different from the usual run of property. It seems to me that, since Wherry housing is an unusual type of investment, some consideration should be given to the particular types of value which apply particularly to Wherry housing—that is, the cost of construction, the cost of replacement, and fair depreciation.

Mr. STENNIS. We feel sure that those elements are considered in their proper perspective, under the rules of evidence prevailing in the jurisdiction where the case may be tried. That being true, it is bound to have an influence on the parties as they negotiate, although in other legislation we do prescribe certain rules of evidence which pertain to the subject matter which the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi for the masterful job he has done in connection with this bill, and I wish also to compliment the other members of the Armed Services Committee.

Limiting myself to the subject of Wherry housing, the Senator is well aware of my views on the subject. I have discussed it with him many times, both in the Senate and outside the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has been very helpful in the discussion of this troublesome subject.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator.

My own feeling is that if the Federal Government is given the right to step in and take away from private individuals properties which they own, certainly the government should pay just compensation. It seems to me that in the case of a Wherry project, we are setting two standards. We know that the prices of labor, materials, and everything else

have gone up over a period of 6 or 7 years; yet we are holding the owner to the basic value before prices went up. Then we are taking away from him the cost of bringing the property up to today's values, which are much higher. It is an unfair formula.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is referring to the matter of negotiation between the parties, I assume.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad the Senator brought that out, because it is my understanding that, in the handling of the cases the Department of Justice at least is insisting upon a very narrow criterion for setting the value.

Mr. STENNIS. In the cases in court?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Those which have come under the control of the Department of Justice. I like what the Senator from Mississippi has said, and I wish to back him up. The Senator was a distinguished judge in his State, and I know of no better lawyer in the Senate than the Senator from Mississippi. If I understand correctly what he says, it is that the language which it is anticipated will be put in the bill will be to the effect that the commissioners shall be appointed by the court and that they will be governed by the rules of evidence obtaining in the State where the cases are to be tried.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They will not be held down by any single criterion.

Mr. STENNIS. No. In the condemnation proceedings, they go into court for all purposes. They cannot have one foot in and one foot out. They cannot be bound by what the Department of Justice says, or by what the Federal Housing Administrator says, or by what anybody else says. All of them can testify, but the commissioners are controlled by the judge of the court, and by the rulings the judge makes. It is a legal question and a matter of judicial evidence, and the value will be determined accordingly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a general matter, may I ask the Senator from Mississippi if he believes that a project which is bought as a going project ought to be valued as a going concern today?

Mr. STENNIS. That is certainly one of the elements of value, and I believe it is a major element of value. I would not say that the only element of value is its replacement cost now.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not use that term. I used the terms "going project" and "going concern."

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; I imagine that would be a part of the testimony before the commissioners.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator from Alabama has concluded.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say that I appreciate the cooperation we have received from the Senator from Mississippi. Housing is a topic which comes under dual committee jurisdiction. From the very beginning, as the Senator knows, when the housing bill was before us, we tried to remedy the situation. I realize the opposition which was stated by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] at that time and, I take it, the Armed

Services Committee has been trying to improve upon what we did in the housing bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to have had the opportunity to negotiate with the Senator for some changes, and I appreciate his cooperation.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Alabama has been very cooperative and quite helpful in his suggestions to us, which we have adopted, and will offer in the form of an amendment. The Senator from South Dakota, who is necessarily absent today on official business, is very much interested in the general subject and has been quite effective in working on it. The subcommittee members believe that the amendments we will offer will also represent the thinking of the Senator from South Dakota on the subject.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to thank the Senator from Mississippi and the members of the subcommittee, especially the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], in addition to the Senator from Mississippi, for the consideration the subcommittee has given to the problem which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has discussed and in which I am interested because of the number of Wherry projects in the State of Tennessee. I am glad to hear the expression from the Senator from Mississippi that the local rules of evidence will be used, and not the procedure the Department of Justice follows.

Mr. STENNIS. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that any other rule would be invalid and unconstitutional and, in effect, a confiscation of property without just compensation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I hope the cases will be settled or compromised without the necessity of going to court. The Department of Justice is following an unrealistic and, as it seems to me, an unfair procedure so far as the adequate compensation rule is concerned. It makes it almost impossible for the parties to negotiate a fair settlement from their viewpoint. I would hope that the Department of Justice would take into consideration the going value of the operation as defined by the Senator from Alabama, just as the commissioners will, under the rules of evidence, when they come to the trial of the cases.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's remarks. Of course, for the information of the Senate, some, although not all, of the Wherry housing projects were characterized by the so-called windfall profits, which gave so much trouble to the just, as well as to the unjust, and in connection with which Congress has been trying to prescribe a procedure which would be fair to all.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to point out again the unique position of these properties. They have been built for occupancy by Government employees. If we consider only the value separate and apart from what the Defense Department may use them for, it would be unfair to the owners. If we considered the properties as compared with some other

properties, that would not be quite fair, either, because there are no similar properties. I believe we must consider the value of the properties to the Government for the use the Government is going to make of them. That ought to be one of the prime considerations in arriving at the value.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe the Senator's comment is very timely. I feel the condemnation cases will carry out that objective as a part of the entire procedure.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee brings out a very important point. Would the Senator from Mississippi accept an amendment at the bottom of page 153 to insert the words "to the government" after the word "value," so as to make the language read: "give full consideration to all elements of value to the Government"? The Senator from Tennessee has pointed out that the value to the Government certainly should be considered.

Mr. STENNIS. That is certainly one of the elements of value; however, it is not the sole one. It is not the sole or controlling one. Any court would admit testimony of that nature. Unless the Government considered them of some value, it would not be condemning them or asking for them.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is there any objection to putting it in the bill?

Mr. STENNIS. We want to make it clear that the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Department of Justice, and anyone else has no special standing in court and that the cases will be decided as a judicial matter according to the rules of evidence pertaining to such matters.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe it would be a great contribution toward clarifying the subject if the words "to the Government" could be added. Certainly the properties are not worth anything except as properties which have some value to the Government.

Mr. STENNIS. The owner might not want such testimony to go into the case, because the Government may testify that, after all, the property is not worth much to it.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Government is going to take over the property, it seems to me its value to the Government is a fundamental element for consideration.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Let me answer that question. My view is that if such matters are considered in a condemnation proceeding, there cannot be a better rule written than the judicial rule which the courts already have applied in such cases to property of all kinds. The court adjusts itself to the particular case always. I think we will do harm to one side or to both sides if we try to write rules of evidence on which the court is to hear this type of case. That is why I have resisted all such proposals.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I can understand, under ordinary circumstances, the judicial soundness of the attitude of the Senator from Mississippi with reference to

rules of evidence. But after all, the properties which are being condemned, if they are being condemned for what they could be rented for to taxpayers, or for what they could be rented on the open market, would not have much value at all, because the houses were built for a special use. The only one to whom they are of any real value is the Government itself.

I do not think this proposal makes any exception which has not been made in other types of cases where there are unique situations. I think language might be considered along the lines suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire, that after the words "shall give full consideration to all elements of value," there be inserted "including the value to the Government."

It seems to me that is an element of fairness, and is something to which the attention of the court should be directed because of the uniqueness of the property.

Mr. STENNIS. I think in an ordinary case that certainly would be admissible evidence, unless it were objected to by the owner himself. But I believe we will be borrowing trouble if we try to write into the bill the ground rules upon which the court will have to conduct the condemnation proceeding. Now the rules apply to all alike, and they have already been formulated in that area of the law.

Mr. BRIDGES. I could see a reason for the Senator's argument if the language provided that the court should give consideration to all elements of value to Joe Doakes or John Doe. But so far as the Government is concerned, which is the principal entity outside the owner, I cannot see any reason for not including the words I have suggested. It seems to me it would be logical to do so. I do not see how they could do any harm; I think they could do nothing but good.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. One thing I think we should keep in mind about the Wherry projects is that the Government has the unusual privilege of taking them over. The owner has nothing to say about it at all. We should make certain that whatever is written into the law is an absolute assurance that the owner will be dealt with fairly. That is all I ask for; and as I understand, that is the purpose of the language suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think we are all really in agreement as to what we want. We want to have the owner treated fairly.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I understand, the entire subject matter will be in conference when the bill goes to the House.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is nothing in the House bill pertaining to this subject.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correctly advised on that point.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly hope the finest thought may be given to this proposal, to make certain that the person from whom our great Government is taking the property may be treated fairly in the transaction. That is all any of us could ask for.

In that connection, I commend the Senator from Mississippi and his committee for a very fine statement in the report with respect to Wherry housing. I should like to read it, because I think it is well that it appear in the Record. The statement appears on page 46 of the report. It reads:

In addition, the committee has included an amendment to the housing amendments of 1955, designed to clarify and stabilize the procedures for acquiring Wherry housing projects by condemnation.

Then listen closely to this:

The committee takes this action primarily because it has been informed, and has a sound basis to believe correctly, that the criteria utilized in the acquisition of Wherry projects has varied from service to service with a resultant lack of acceptable uniformity. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense, who should now have no doubt about his authority, to establish a standard procedure which, in the interest of clarity, just compensation, and equitable treatment of all concerned, will be followed by the entire Department.

I think that in a few words the Senator from Mississippi and his committee have pointed up the real difficulty of this matter. I am informed that some of the services have administered this part of the law fairly and with good results, while other services have not. The Senator from Mississippi has well pointed out the lack of uniformity. I commend him for his statement. I hope there may be gained from the discussion we have had in the Senate on this question what the intent of Congress is, namely, that the act be administered with uniformity and fairness to all.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Alabama. It is our purpose to give this program a new start. It has been vexing not only to Senators, but also to Wherry housing owners and to others.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. In connection with the comment made by the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama, who read from page 46 of the report, I may say that that language was included because of the complaints which the committee received from some of the occupants of Wherry housing. When that language is considered within the context of the bill now before the Senate, we have in effect a legislative history which provides guidelines that will give the litigant a fair measure of damages in keeping with sound judicial procedure.

The colloquy which has taken place here and the language in the report will provide adequate protection for those whose property will be acquired.

The Senate should be advised that our committee has been also deeply concerned with the question of land acquisition. We have had the problem of farm people who lose their property in

condemnation proceedings. Many of those people point out, and can properly do so, unique situations, which we, as a body, cannot begin to contemplate in every instance.

In connection with the Wherry acquisition program, we must make every effort to be certain that there are guidelines which will give the courts, in the end, sufficient flexibility to mete out justice and to provide just compensation.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has made a splendid statement.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator from Mississippi, who has worked so ably and conscientiously upon the bill, specifically accept and take to conference an amendment striking out certain words?

Mr. STENNIS. I might advise the Senator that we have already announced we will propose an amendment which will strike out the words at the bottom of page 153. Has the Senator been advised about the committee amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; to strike out the words "in accordance with existing law, and"?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; on the last part of page 153 and at the top of page 154, to strike out: "shall give full consideration to all elements of value in accordance with existing law, and." We decided that was too tight and might refer back to standards of value in other places of the law. We want to leave this an open judicial question without hindrance or advantage either to the Government or to the Wherry landowner or to the services.

Mr. BRIDGES. As I understand, the Senator proposes to strike out all after the period which follows the word "court" on line 24, through the word "and" on the first line of page 154.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator will read with me, beginning on line 24, the amendment, if adopted, will read like this:

Any commission appointed hereunder shall have the powers of a master.

That language omits all reference to the words "elements of value."

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator from Mississippi read again what would be deleted?

Mr. STENNIS. On page 153, beginning in line 24, the sentence commencing at that point will read as follows:

Any commission appointed hereunder—

And then there will be omitted the following words—

shall give full consideration to all elements of value in accordance with existing law and.

And then, under the change, the sentence will continue. As thus changed, the sentence will read as follows:

Any commission appointed hereunder shall have the powers of a master provided in subdivision (c) of rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—

And so forth. Of course, the latter is another subject matter, and relates to the power to call witnesses.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi accept an amendment reading as follows:

Any commission appointed hereunder shall give full consideration to all elements of value to the Government and shall have the powers of a master provided in subdivision (c) —

And so forth.

Mr. STENNIS. We would respectfully have to decline to recommend that amendment, for the reasons already stated, namely, that we want to keep this a wide-open matter of judicial procedure. The rules of evidence under the judicial system prevailing in the particular locality would prevail.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me ask whether the Senator from Mississippi has been instructed by the committee to oppose all amendments.

Mr. STENNIS. The subcommittee has gone into the matter so thoroughly and so fully that we have concluded that we shall have to oppose any amendments which would seek to write into the bill any provision regarding elements of value in respect to the judicial proceedings.

Mr. BRIDGES. But the Senator from Mississippi has already eliminated a part of the language, by agreeing to accept an amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. We decided that the language we had placed there possibly did introduce elements of value which were found at some places in the law—for instance, in the law on the Public Housing Administration. Therefore, we struck out that clause, so as to make certain that the door to the courtroom would be open, with no hindrance or no advantage to anyone.

Mr. BRIDGES. But the Senator from Mississippi has changed the position of the subcommittee in respect to not accepting amendments.

Mr. STENNIS. We were convinced that we had left doubt about the position we wished to state clearly and firmly; and the language I have read is in line with that conviction on our part.

Mr. BRIDGES. However, the Senator from Mississippi has now accepted one amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. But the amendment the Senator from New Hampshire has proposed would be directly contrary to the purpose of the subcommittee in having the language changed in the way the subcommittee has asked the Senate to change it.

I assure the Senator from New Hampshire that we are not being arbitrary. We have had this matter under consideration and study for years. We believe that with the courtroom door open now, without any hindrance, limitation, or favor to any party, this problem probably will be solved; and with the door to the courtroom open, the negotiators will more easily be able to get together.

Let me say that I appreciate the interest of the Senator from New Hampshire in this question.

OVERSEAS BASES

The bill would authorize some \$250 million for the construction of facilities at various overseas bases. Approx-

mately 280 major overseas bases are utilized by our military forces throughout the world—excluding, of course, certain small and isolated stations.

As of June 30, 1957, approximately 41 percent of our Armed Forces were stationed either abroad or with the operating forces afloat or mobile. Today's percentages are quite similar.

At this point I should like to call attention to the figures at the top of page 48, which indicate the magnitude of the dollar authorizations past, present, and estimated future, pertaining to the bases covered by this bill, alone.

During the hearings, we requested that Department of Defense furnish similar figures for all overseas bases, but it was impossible to receive the information in time for it to be included in the report. We have indicated to the Defense Department that we expect these figures to be furnished at the time of submission of next year's construction bill.

The figure we had for overseas base construction—and the figure is limited, of course, to bases covered by the authorizations included in the pending bill—is \$6,925,966,000. That amount includes estimated future authorization requirements for the completion of the bases, and also includes some authorizations which have not yet been utilized. But this is the only way to understand the magnitude of the developments we are making year by year.

I know that I speak for the other committee members when I say that we have no quarrel regarding the need for certain overseas bases. In fact, such are essential to our national security. However, there is one area of grave concern. I refer to the apparent trend toward increasing overseas costs and personnel strengths. For example, while the total military and civilian operational personnel decreased during the 14 months' period ending March 1957 from approximately 690,000 to approximately 640,000, during the same period the overseas dependent population increased from approximately 348,000 to approximately 409,000. It is difficult to believe that this betters our overseas combat capability. So we ask the question, "How far are we going when, at a time when we are decreasing the overseas operating personnel by as much as 50,000 persons, we increase the dependent personnel by 61,000 persons?"

Salary costs alone on the above figures, predicated on an average of \$5,000 a year for military individuals and \$6,000 a year per civilian, create an annual payroll of nearly \$3½ billion. It is estimated that \$10,000 is required to move a family overseas.

In the report we call upon the Secretary of Defense to review this situation, because if constant vigilance is not maintained, the following unacceptable conditions could result:

First. Individuals and units stationed overseas could become so engrossed in their own daily housekeeping that they would do serious damage to their military mission.

Second. Unacceptable immobility, due to the imbalanced percentage of non-

combatants to combat troops. Large and vulnerable numbers of dependents stationed in potential theaters of combat might well introduce personal considerations into the minds of those who should be solely preoccupied with military operations. It is to be noted that at one Air Force installation within easy reach of potential enemy missiles, approximately 82 percent of the officers and 46 percent of the airmen are accompanied by their families. There are 3,200 high school and elementary students attending base schools—and this in an area where mobility is said to be one of the prime methods of defending the base—if “defense” is the proper word.

Third. The cost of maintaining and providing logistical support for overseas installations could exceed their military value.

REAL ESTATE

I shall not take the Senate's time today, unless there are questions, to cover in detail the real property under the control of the Department of Defense. The data are set forth, commencing on page 50 of the report. There are approximately 27 million acres under the control of the military in the United States.

While the report acknowledges the Department of Defense efforts toward the disposal of surplus real estate, it indicates that the committee is frankly disappointed at the results obtained so far, and expects the Secretary of Defense, who should no longer have any doubt about his authority, to move rapidly in this field.

COMPETITIVE BID PROCEDURES AND CONTRACT SUPERVISION

On page 55 of the report there is shown a tabulation which indicates the comparative procedures of competitive bid contracts versus negotiated contracts for military construction during the past 5½ years. The committee is pleased to note that the experience in the construction field indicates that more than 90 percent of all contracts have been let on a competitive bid basis.

I believe that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] will have a special word to say about this matter. He is very familiar with it, and also with the provisions of the bill in regard to competitive bids.

We are glad to report that more than 90 percent of all contracts have been let on competitive bids, although it is obvious that some have to be let otherwise.

HOSPITALS AND DEPENDENT MEDICAL CARE

At this time I should like to draw the Senate's attention to page 56 of the report, pertaining to hospital and dependent medical care. It is obvious that medical facilities are not being utilized to the extent of their capacity. At the beginning of calendar 1958, the normal bed capacity of the medical facilities of the three services was approximately 85,000. The daily average of beds occupied was less than 31,000. Dependents occupied less than 6,000 of this 31,000, and, as may be remembered, other legislation previously passed by Congress has provided that dependents may receive certain medical care, either at military

installations or local civilian medical facilities under a health plan, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

In view of the lack of complete utilization of existing medical facilities, the committee adopted the policy of recommending for disapproval, at least for this year, hospital facilities designed to replace existing ones, and until the committee is convinced that maximum utilization is being accomplished at existing facilities.

Perhaps this matter will come up during the debate on the appropriation bill. The cost schedule with reference to this program begins on page 56 of the report and continues on page 57.

Until the matter is cleared up and a preliminary policy established, we thought we should not continue building further military hospitals except in isolated areas, because, under this medical care program, it has developed, within the last year and a half, in many places that the hospital population of the area has been quickly depleted. Until a firmer policy is established, we thought we should not approve replacement hospitals in this bill—and there are not many in it—except some small ones in places where hospital facilities do not otherwise exist.

We had hearings with reference to the National Guard and other Reserve unit construction programs.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to express my thanks to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who has so ably presented the bill authorizing military construction. There is no greater need in our country today than the maintenance of our military strength. I express my admiration to the committee, through the Senator from Mississippi, which has so ably dealt with this highly important subject. It is for the security of the country. At the same time I express my appreciation for what has been provided for my own State of West Virginia. For many years there has been a neglect of and a passing over of my State in the matter of military installations which are justified. Therefore, the Senator from Mississippi will understand my feeling of approval that the Senate has added to the bill quite a number of installations in my State with respect to the Army National Guard, and also for the Army Reserve and the Air National Guard. While quite a number of those projects did not appear in the House bill, I am particularly gratified that they are included in the Senate version of the bill.

I express the hope to the Senator from Mississippi that when the bill goes to conference the Senate conferees will stand by the authorizations provided in the bill, which are so badly needed in my State. I hope the House conferees will agree to them in conference, and that the great need for them will be pointed out and sustained.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his remarks, which are so timely. We think one of the great morale builders of the whole military program is the maintenance of the Reserve Com-

ponents, including the National Guard, which is a source of military pride as well as patriotism. We hope we can prevail in conference. I am sure the Senator realizes the bill does not provide the money.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I realize the bill does not carry the appropriation, but it is the first step in authorizing construction. I may point out to the Senator that the matter is one which goes beyond a question of pride; it has become a matter of necessity for our defenses. Up to now my State has lagged behind in the authorization of military installations. The bill now presents a great step forward. It is a needed step at this time when the defenses of our country must be kept modern and alert. These branches of the service are just as essential to the security of our country as are any part of our defense forces.

Again I express to the Senator and to his committee my appreciation and my feeling of gratitude for considering these very needed projects, and for placing them in the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. We found that throughout the Nation \$35 million of local funds had already been appropriated by local authorities and States and were awaiting matching funds.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his courtesy. I should like to commend him, as so many of our colleagues have done, for the splendid and painstaking job he has done in putting this complicated bill together and coming before the Senate with a measure which I feel will have the overwhelming approval of the Senate.

There is one item about which, as a Senator from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I am a little disappointed. If the Senator will indulge me, I should like to outline the situation briefly and then ask him a question or two.

Mr. STENNIS. Very well.

Mr. CLARK. On page 4 of the House bill there was an authorization for \$2,274,000 for three projects to be undertaken at Carlisle Barracks, near Carlisle, Pa., where, as the Senator well knows, the Army War College is located. I think it is the oldest military post in the United States of America. As the Senator knows, the Army War College is one of the finest of our institutions, and of the greatest possible use in adequately training members of the Army for their profession.

In the Senate version of the bill, however, on page 85, the House authorization has been reduced from \$2,274,000 to only \$374,000, the net effect of which is to permit the acquisition of approximately 50 acres of land which are very badly needed by the War College to round out the property which it owns and to make it possible, at a later date, to erect a hospital. The Senate committee version of the bill would also authorize a small amount of money for a couple of additional officers' houses. But the principal reduction is due to the fact that the hospital which was urged

on the committee by the Army, and which was accepted by the House, has been cut out of the Senate committee substitute.

I have had an opportunity to review the hearings in this regard. I ask the indulgence of my colleague while I turn to page 625 of those hearings, where the justification for that hospital is set forth. To me it appeared to be a complete and thorough justification. I shall read the key sentence:

The denial of this project would cause the continued use of a highly unsatisfactory facility which is both inefficient and costly to operate. Also, it will not allow the consolidation and joint utilization of facilities as proposed by the Department of Defense; therefore, the benefit and economies in materials and personnel cannot be effected.

I wonder if my friend from Mississippi would object if I asked unanimous consent to have the detailed justification for the project, which appears on page 625 of the hearings, made a part of the RECORD at this point.

Mr. STENNIS. There is no objection from the committee.

There being no objection, the justification was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Detailed justification follows:

Hospital, 50 to 100 bed, 50,000 square feet (\$1,920,000): The present hospital serving this installation is a collection of buildings which have been erected over the past 48 years. The permanent part of this plant was built in 1908 and contains 14,770 square feet. With the event of World War II, it was necessary to expand this hospital by the construction of mobilization-type structures. As a result, a very inefficient hospital plant evolved, with administrative offices, obstetrical, outpatient, and laboratory facilities in the permanent building. Bed space, dining facilities, X-ray, surgery, and the dental clinic are in one-story wood buildings of mobilization design sited across a main highway. Supply and service facilities are housed in wood buildings located approximately one-half mile from the remainder of the hospital. The dispersion of the various hospital elements throughout the buildings noted above, is contributory to the inefficiency of this hospital plant. The permanent two-story building has outlived its useful life, in that electrical, plumbing, and mechanical systems were not designed for present day load or service. Over 48 years, the requirements for various scientific or professional equipment has changed and this building was not designed for this equipment. As a result, many deficiencies in space or facility exists. Also, methods and procedures used in medical treatments have changed over the period of life of this building. This creates many problems and inefficiencies.

The wood temporary buildings have long outlived their expected useful life. They were designed for mobilization use and do not have the finishes, appurtenances, or structural stability characteristic for long-range utilization. Also, these buildings are combustible and constitute a fire hazard.

The permanent building is separated from the temporary structures by a heavily traveled main highway. The buildings where patients are housed are located less than 40 yards from a main line of a railroad which has considerable freight traffic, thus creating a noise level that is highly detrimental to patients. Also, the cleanliness of the hospital due to fly ash is a constant problem due to location of the post central heating plant, which is approximately 150 yards from hospital buildings.

Based upon the local hospitalization rates, experience, and long-range strengths to be served (5,200), and the hospital bed requirements of the other military services, in this area, the size has been determined. This hospital will provide hospitalization for all military personnel and their dependents, living in the Carlisle-Harrisburg area.

The permanent building will be diverted to administrative use, while the temporary wood buildings will be demolished.

The denial of this project would cause the continued use of a highly unsatisfactory facility which is both inefficient and costly to operate. Also, it will not allow the consolidation and joint utilization of facilities as proposed by the Department of Defense; therefore, the benefit and economies in materials and personnel cannot be effected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Mississippi can tell me the thinking of the committee as to this particular project, which appears, at least, to be in the public interest, and which I think would result, in the end, in economies and greater efficiency, but which was deleted by the Senate, although approved by the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Mississippi will yield to me before he answers the question.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Pennsylvania has a statement on this particular item, I assume.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I join my distinguished colleague in his statement with reference to the Carlisle Barracks. The Carlisle Barracks is the oldest fort in continuous service in the United States, except for the period when the Carlisle Indian School was at those barracks. It might be interesting to my colleagues to know that the old guardhouse, still in existence, was built by Hessian prisoners during the Revolutionary War.

The Carlisle Barracks is now used for our War College. The War College is where we train the men to do the high echelon staff work. These men ought to have fine surroundings, because they have a most difficult job. I have spoken at the barracks several times. The finest young men of our Army are trained there.

I think what my distinguished colleague is asking for would be a great morale builder, if the committee feels the proposal can be sustained in conference. I sincerely hope the distinguished Senator from Mississippi will be agreeable to taking the matter to conference, because I think it would be very helpful to have it provided. I was at Carlisle Barracks not long ago. The item refers to a piece of ground which will add greatly to the surroundings and be a great morale builder.

It is necessary to have the staff elements of our Army developed as rapidly as possible during these critical times.

I apologize for interrupting, and I apologize for taking up the time, but I want to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, the statements made by the two Senators from Pennsylvania have really been helpful in getting all the

facts before the Senate on the very timely point which they raise as to an important institution.

A part of our position with reference to striking the authorization for the installation from the bill was the uncertainty of the medicare program, which is going to have to be settled in the next few days in the major defense appropriation bill. I have alluded to that somewhat already.

We find some costs are running \$50 a day, whereas the cost in the Army hospitals is only \$26 a day. We thought this matter was being brought to a head and that we would hold up authorization of additional hospitals until the point was cleared up. On a second look, any hospital which is actually needed and in which the population of patients is not likely to be greatly lessened under the medicare program, whatever form the program takes, we would not hesitate to agree to in conference. This hospital will be considered in conference, and I can assure the Senators it will have additional consideration at that time. In the meantime, the statements the Senators have made have been helpful, and we expect to run a special check as to the prospects of permanent need. We do not want to build another installation at a place where the patients will go to private physicians.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield further.

Mr. CLARK. I had in mind offering an amendment to the bill which would reinstate the item of \$1,930,000 of authorization which the House granted and the Senate committee struck out. I am not insensible to the lack of much chance of having such an amendment agreed to unless my good friend from Mississippi is willing to accept such an amendment, and of course I realize he cannot accept every amendment proposed on the floor. However, I should like to ask the Senator the direct question: Is he willing to accept such an amendment?

Mr. STENNIS. The committee would not want to accept an amendment at this point, Mr. President. However, as I said, we can certainly assure the Senator from Pennsylvania that this matter is under continuing consideration. We have already requested that the services provide an additional report and a special report on this hospital, with consideration to be given to the idea of permanence. We are not only going to reconsider the matter, but I think the Senator is going to have a pretty strong case. We will doubtless, by that time, I think largely on this floor, have determined the medicare program.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further briefly?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. In view of the comments the Senator has made, I hope that when the bill goes to conference he will have an open mind, as I am sure he will, with respect to the arguments which I am confident will be proposed by the other body in support of their authorization.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator may be assured, certainly, speaking for the Senator from Mississippi and I think for other members of the subcommittee, as well as all the conferees, that that will be the case.

Mr. CLARK. My distinguished friend is also a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and I am sure in due course an appropriation bill to implement the authorization bill will be before the Committee on Appropriations. It is my understanding that because of certain procedural difficulties the House appropriation bill does not include even the \$374,000 which the Senate authorized.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. I ask my good friend whether he can see his way clear to taking a pretty strong position in the Senate Committee on Appropriations to provide for Pennsylvania at least that much of the money, so badly needed, to round out a very important installation.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi can only go this far on that question, Mr. President: With respect to the authorizations we are recommending in this bill, under the facts before us, the Senator from Mississippi would expect to favor an appropriation. However, we do take another look at the entire picture, of course, in the Committee on Appropriations. It is possible that some items, including those of interest to the Senator from Pennsylvania, would fall in the category which would have to be deferred. I would want some freedom in that regard.

Mr. CLARK. My only hope is that when my good friend takes his look at the matter it will be with his usual kindly disposition, that there will be no steel in his eye, and that he will think pretty hard and pretty long about needs of Carlisle Barracks for the money.

Mr. STENNIS. I am always pleased when I can please the Senators from Pennsylvania.

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania was one of my early guides in the Senate in the Committee on Public Works. Whenever I want to ask a military question for his decision, I call him "General," and whenever I want to ask for a decision on a senatorial matter I call him "Senator."

I have been favored, certainly, with the alertness and thoroughness of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania in the presentation of matters with reference to his State. The Senator makes a very strong appeal today. We will give the matter a second look.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for yielding, and for his courtesy in considering this item.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senate for the consideration and attention which Senators have given to the bill. I hope my colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] will be ready to proceed in a moment.

I should like to add a few words with reference to the National Guard and Reserve programs.

RESERVE COMPONENT CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS

As I have previously indicated, this year for the first time the annual construction bill includes authorizations for both the active forces and for the Reserve components. By Reserve components I mean the Organized Reserves and the Army and Air National Guard.

The bill upon which the committee took testimony in this field was S. 3863. Its provisions as recommended by the committee were included under title VI of this bill and a description of the committee's actions appears on page 58 and then again on page 94.

As originally presented, S. 3863 contained authorization requests in the amount of approximately \$30 million, divided between the Navy and Marine Corps, \$11,892,000, and the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard, \$18,248,000.

No additional authorizations were requested for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve because the Department of Defense indicated that there existed a carryover in the fiscal year 1959 program from prior year authorizations in the amount of approximately \$45 million. The inference was that the \$45 million was adequate to provide construction for the next 12 months. The committee took exception to this philosophy. It considers that the National Guard and the Organized Reserve are absolutely essential to the national defense. It firmly believes that our Reserve components must be provided with adequate armories and the other facilities needed for their training.

Testimony taken last year indicated that of the 2,000 locations where Army Reserves training was being carried out, a little better than 500 were considered adequate and that the Army National Guard had a requirement for 800 additional facilities. The lack of request for additional Army Reserve and National Guard authorizations is most surprising in view of the fact that the committee is informed that various States and communities have already made available approximately \$35 million as their contribution toward participation, and if the Federal Government were to provide its 75-percent share, there would need to be made available almost \$100 million more in authorizations and funds.

Testimony from senior National Guard officials indicated a dire need for many new National Guard armories. At the committee's request, the National Guard Bureau submitted a list of 142 projects. The Guard Bureau testified that these projects were in accord with requests and priorities established by the adjutants general of the States involved, and that State-matching funds and sites were already available. The Guard Bureau's letter of transmittal also indicated that these projects, both armory and nonarmory, had been reviewed for compliance with defense criteria and that they met continuing requirements in accordance with the new forces structure of the Army National Guard—that

they are all most essential and eligible for Federal participation.

As a result the committee added line item projects for the Army National Guard in the amount of approximately \$23 million and for the Army Reserve in the amount of approximately \$5 million.

With regard to the previously mentioned \$45 million carryover, during the course of the hearings, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations, by letter dated June 18, 1958, furnished the committee a list of projects for each reserve component showing them by location, type, and indicating those for which existing authorizations would carry over into fiscal year 1959. This list appears in the printed hearings beginning on page 836.

In taking the action to add the line item projects for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve mentioned previously, we want to make completely clear that this additional authorization would be in addition to projects heretofore approved and in addition to those covered in the carryover list conveyed by Secretary Bryant's letter of June 18. The added authorizations recommended by the committee are not intended as a priority but rather as a supplement to the carryover list.

The additions to the Army National Guard portions of the bill to those furnished by the National Guard Bureau because these were stated to be consistent with the priority selections made by the Adjutants General of the various States and were in conformance with defense criteria.

However, in order to assure that projects not now included on this list but which might become eligible prior to the submission of next year's construction bill, 10 percent flexibility has been provided in section 607 (b).

CONCLUSION

I invite the attention of the Senators to the fact that the committee report contains a breakdown by State and by military department. The State breakdowns begin on page 102 of the report and the title breakdown by department begins with title I of the Army on page 61.

In many instances it was difficult to make decisions. We endeavored to review each problem on a fair and impartial basis. The committee claims no infallibility but hopes that it has exercised its best judgment, bearing in mind the requirements of national defense.

Without further detail, Mr. President, and as the committee report is before each Member, and I hope adequate to provide information of the specifics, I will now be happy to attempt to answer any further questions that my colleagues may have.

Mr. President, I should like to express my special appreciation to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. President, the Armed Services Committee recommends the bill be given favorable consideration, as reported.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he yields the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I should like to ask a question for information. I have appreciated and enjoyed very much the Senator's very fine report. I should like to offer at the proper time an amendment to provide another armory in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Is this the appropriate time to offer such an amendment?

Mr. STENNIS. We have some small committee amendments to be considered. I think those amendments should be considered first, Mr. President, and then amendments from the floor would be in order.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has made a very able and comprehensive presentation of the pending measure. I see no need to review the bill as a whole.

I should like to say, however, that the able chairman of our subcommittee and my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is unable to be present today because of official business elsewhere, together with the professional staff member, Col. Kenneth BeLieu, have made a real contribution. I must say, in bringing before the Senate a bill which carries out the established military policy of the United States and at the same time brings about some reasonable economies.

We are all aware that military expenditures are going up. The Congress, particularly the Senate, is now in the process of adding a very substantial sum which will be considered shortly in connection with our overall defense appropriations.

I point out that the committee has brought about reductions totaling about half a billion dollars. The reductions, for the most part, represent fat that we can get along without. The bone and the muscle are in the bill. We have done nothing to weaken the military posture of our country. On the contrary, in this bill we have provided the necessary military construction support to carry out the established military policy of the Nation.

The committee report, ably prepared by Colonel BeLieu, is an invaluable bible of information, essential in the consideration of the pending measure.

It was said earlier in the debate that it would be well for Members of the Senate and their staffs to read in particular that portion of the committee report beginning on page 10, which sets forth the military policy of the country and gives to Members of the Senate a detailed policy statement, which is so basic to an understanding of the bill before us.

I invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the fact that in our effort to bring about as great a saving as possible we have not lost sight of the defense needs of the country.

I read from page 55 of the report, beginning near the bottom of the page:

The committee is pleased to note that the experience in the construction field indicates that better than 90 percent of all contracts have been let on a competitive-bid basis; however, it feels that improvements can still be made. It recognizes, of course, that under certain classified conditions and at special overseas locations it may be necessary to resort to negotiated contracts. There is a grave danger, however, that negotiated procedures may result in excessive costs and inefficiency, especially when adequate supervision by qualified military and civilian engineers representing the Government is not constantly maintained. The committee particularly views with alarm the growing trend to let huge contracts for the construction of missile facilities on a negotiated basis. The use of package-type contracts for design and construction activities with industrial manufacturers could well result in the following:

(a) Large sums of appropriated funds controlled and expended as the contractor sees fit.

(b) Excessive concentration of vast sums of money in the hands of a single contractor.

(c) Inadequate or no supervision of the design and construction by qualified representatives of the Government.

(d) Competition between two or more military services for resources, materials, equipment, and personnel.

In view of the foregoing, section 506 of this bill repeats the language contained in previous construction bills to the effect that, insofar as possible, contracts under this act should be awarded on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder. In addition, section 506 provides that contracts which shall be executed by the United States under this act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and the supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense in special cases determines otherwise.

This is an area in which we can save some money. It has been the policy of the subcommittee to watch construction items very closely. As a result of the vigilance of the subcommittee, millions of dollars have been saved by forcing the Department of Defense to let more and more work on a competitive bid bases. We have very properly given to the Secretary of Defense the necessary flexibility to let contracts on a basis other than competitive bid in special instances when it is in the interest of the United States to do so, for reasons of national security for example.

I conclude my remarks by saying that in its undertaking we have tried conscientiously to provide the bone and the muscle to support the established military policy of our country, and at the same time effectuate the savings which the people of the country have a right to demand. I believe that our savings have been reasonable, and I know that they will not interfere with the military posture of the country.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues who have complimented the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], on the splendid report which they presented to the Armed Services Committee, and

which has become the report of that committee to the Senate.

Military construction has become a tremendous enterprise. It is a bigger enterprise than it has ever been before, although perhaps not in total amount of dollars, which is approximately \$2,600 million.

This report this year is in the nature of a bible on the subject of United States military policy. The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] called attention to the discussion of the United States military policy as it appears in the report. I believe it is such an important outline, and would be of so much use to Members of the Senate, as well as to the many thousands of people who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that I ask unanimous consent that the outline, as it appears in the report from the bottom of page 10 to the top of page 31, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BUSH. I shall certainly support the bill. I do not believe we have any choice at this time except to support it. Nevertheless, I am staggered by the magnitude of the future expenditures which are contemplated by the armed services. For example, I read, at page 24 of the report:

Witnesses before the committee have indicated that if all the defense systems currently being contemplated by each service were to be established, the total cost would be close to \$8 billion per year for the next 5 years and \$5 billion annually thereafter.

Secretary McElroy has stated, "The capital investment already made in this continental air defense system during the last 4½ years exceeds \$13 billion. The cost of operation is now almost \$2 billion a year." Information in the committee files indicates that Secretary McElroy's figures may be on the low side. Nevertheless, they serve to show the order of magnitude.

Therefore I feel I must support the proposed legislation with a heavy heart. We learned from the discussion this morning that the overseas payroll alone of our military, including civilians employed by the military, amounts to \$3½ billion a year. That is only the payroll.

We now hear the Secretary of Defense being quoted in the press as visualizing the possibility that the budget for military affairs alone may approach the figure of \$70 billion in the not far distant future, at the rate we are going.

Therefore we must look at the bill and at the whole military situation today with apprehension and with a very heavy heart. As I think of these matters, I am minded to look at the figures of the Federal budget in 1933, 1934, and 1935, and to put them in the RECORD at this point, by way of contrast. The total budget of the United States in 1933 was \$5,100,000,000; in 1934, \$9,900,000,000; in 1935, \$4½ billion. We may contrast these figures with the figures we are talking about now, when we have a budget of approximately \$80 billion.

I note from the press service tickers that the Secretary of the Treasury today,

before a House committee, has revised his estimate of the deficit we face in the budget for fiscal year 1959 to \$12 billion. We go merrily on, with an apparent lack of concern for this terribly serious situation.

I do not believe any other government in the world would dare face its people with a deficit of the proportions which our Federal Government faces this year. No town, no city, no State in the United States would dare face its people with proportions such as those which a \$12-billion deficit poses in our whole expenditure program. This points up the need for the Members of the Senate, as well as the Members of the House of Representatives, to give thought between now and the convening of another Congress as to what we shall do about this financial situation, when the Federal deficit is approaching really desperate proportions for the people of the United States.

These figures certainly suggest that one of three alternatives must be followed. First, we must make a sharp cutback in Federal expenditures other than military expenditures—a most unlikely event, judging from the record made in the present session, I am sorry to say. Or we must face the possibility of substantially increased taxes, which I fear also will be regarded as politically inexpedient and highly improbable. Or we must face indefinitely an unbalanced budget, which carries with it hidden taxation in the form of inflation. This will rob the poor people of the country far more than a tax increase could possibly affect them. This should be a matter of very serious concern to all those who live upon fixed incomes, whether they be teachers, preachers, civil servants, or whatever other occupation they may follow. It would be a matter of very serious proportions, concerning which at a later time in this week or before the session ends I intend to have considerably more to say.

My approval of the bill goes with a heavy heart and a sense of real apprehension, because I feel we are becoming very rash and unguided in the way we attempt to manage the affairs of the people of the United States.

I think what I have said points up the need for an item veto, which has been before Congress repeatedly, but which Congress will not accept. It points up the need for a single appropriation bill, which has been sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. It points up the need for the passage of the accrued expenditure appropriation bill, H. R. 8002, which is now on the Senate Calendar and which, I understand, was under discussion during the morning hour. Although I was not in the Chamber, I understand the majority leader gave some assurance that it would be brought before the Senate. I hope it will be, because I think we have reached the time when we should consider every possible measure which may afford us some relief in dealing with what I consider to be a desperately bad financial situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I did not hear the number of the bill to which the Senator referred.

Mr. BUSH. H. R. 8002, the accrued expenditure appropriation bill, which I understood was under discussion earlier today. I was not here then.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would not want the RECORD to show that I gave any assurance that the bill would be brought before the Senate. It has just been reported by the Committee on Appropriations by a divided vote. The committee felt the bill violated some of the rules of the Senate. I stated that I would refer the bill to the policy committee for a determination of what their recommendation will be.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Texas. I hope the policy committee will give the Senate a chance to act on the bill.

EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES MILITARY POLICY

Predicated on a basic national policy of nonaggression supported by the belief that a sound economy is essential to the security of the free world, it can be stated that the military policy of the United States consists of four basic interrelated and mutually supporting concepts. The foregoing represents in the committee's mind a general and broad résumé of the sum total of the various policies enunciated by senior defense officials in statements before this committee over the past several years and focalized during hearings this year. It is quite obvious to the committee that all military personnel and senior civilian officials with the Department of Defense do not agree amongst each other as to the relative importance of these four areas. In fact, each service seems to place its own unilateral measurement upon each one. Nevertheless, it is clear to the committee that these are the prime concepts upon which the various services are basing their requirements for forces. They are:

- (1) Warning (because the enemy can be expected to move first).
- (2) Retaliation (an offensive strike capability second to none in the event of an enemy attack).
- (3) Defense (either 100 percent or sufficient to deter attack and protect retaliation forces).
- (4) Limited war capability (that capability sufficient to handle brush fires or to move strategically in sufficient time and with adequate force to avoid the loss of vital strategic areas and if possible to prevent the outbreak of general war).

This bill contains authorizations designed to meet certain construction requirements relative to the above. Obviously a single bill cannot satisfy all of these requirements. While certain specific details are classified, it is possible to discuss many of the salient ones.

WARNING CONCEPT

All witnesses appeared convinced that we must establish and maintain the best possible warning system. Otherwise the adherence to a policy of nonaggression could prove fatal, especially in an era where reaction time is at a premium. The committee emphatically concurs in this concept. The warning systems must be attuned not only to the military requirements of threat from manned bombers, ballistic missiles and submarines, but also to international diplomatic and political threats. The basic military warning systems consist of:

DEW line

The distant early warning (DEW) line is designed to flash instant warning to a joint Canadian-United States combat operations center located at Colorado Springs, Colo. This headquarters is called the North American Air Defense Command (NORAD). It is designed to be effective against manned bombers and cruise type missiles, but it cannot presently cope with intercontinental ballistic missiles. It consists of a string of radar stations stretching from Point Barrow, Alaska, in the west to Baffin Island in the east and then with eastward and westward extensions into the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, respectively.

Title III (Air Force) contains an authorization request in the amount of \$25 million for the eastward extension.

The program to establish a distant early warning (DEW) line resulted from the consideration of many studies, official and unofficial, of what was needed for the early detection of an air attack upon the United States. The specific recommendation that the United States establish a DEW line came from the Lincoln Summer Study Group, which met in the summer of 1952 to discuss and study air defense problems. This group, composed of scientists, engineers, and military personnel, recommended that a line be established across extreme northern Alaska and Canada to (1) make surprise attack most difficult; (2) improve active and passive defensive capabilities; (3) minimize disruptive disorganization upon attack; and (4) make possible the concept of effective "defense in depth."

Following the summer study group recommendations, presentations on concepts were made to high level Government agencies. As a result, the Air Research and Development Command of the Air Force was given responsibility, in late 1952, for developing techniques. In this program, the Air Research and Development Command, with Western Electric Co. as a prime contractor, constructed and tested a prototype facility in the United States.

In 1954, Western Electric Co. was given a prime contract to prepare an outline plan and systems engineering study for a warning system in the Arctic, and to proceed with the architectural work and plans for implementing the entire project. Nineteen hundred and fifty-four is considered as the date when the active portion of the project to implement DEW line began; the initial portion became operational in mid-1957.

The Air Force has increased the scope of the original project to provide for eastern and western extensions of the now operational center portion. Land-based radars in Alaska and along the Aleutian Islands are being improved, installed, and integrated into the system to provide an extended capability. Also, in order that the North American portion may be tied into NATO early warning systems, the United States is extending the line to the east. The Air Force also has active plans to modernize it with newer equipment in order to keep it abreast of the increasing capabilities of modern aircraft.

DEW line, coupled with associated airborne early warning aircraft and picket ships, should provide for prompt warning of an attack on the United States by air-breathing vehicles, such as the manned bomber and cruise type missiles such as the SNARK.

While the DEW line in its present configuration will not provide early warning of an ICBM attack, this will not negate its usefulness for many years to come. The line will be a necessary part of our air defense system as long as a potential enemy has the capability of launching an attack by manned bombers and cruise-type missiles. Present

indications are that such a situation could exist many years into the future. Further, the DEW line is a valuable aid to navigation our own and friendly aircraft in the areas covered; this can continue indefinitely.

The Air Force states that tests of the DEW line recently conducted prove it is performing within or better than design capability. It is hoped that it will never have to be used for its intended purpose; but if it is, it will be there.

The Air Force states that the programed construction costs for DEW line through fiscal year 1959 are as follows:

DEW line (main)	\$297, 900, 000
DEW line (west)	40, 000, 000
DEW line (east)	45, 000, 000

The above figures, however, do not accurately portray all the totals involved. It has been estimated that the ultimate cost of DEW line will be in excess of \$1 billion and that its annual operating cost will be around \$200 million.

Mid-Canada line

DEW line is backed up by the mid-Canada line, a radar chain extending across Canada at the latitude of approximately 55° north. It is essentially a radar fence consisting of gap-filler radars (unmanned) that have the capability of warning of aircraft penetration. These stations cannot, however, determine direction or speed.

PINE TREE line

Extending roughly along the United States-Canadian border is the PINE TREE

line, an integrated warning, tracking, and ground controlled electronic system which can direct interceptors to enemy aircraft traversing the area.

Aircraft control and warning

While DEW line is designed to provide the warning of penetration by enemy forces around the perimeter where it has been constructed, it is backed up and supported by aircraft control and warning stations located throughout the United States, Alaska, and Canada. A total of \$125,239,000 is included in the bill for these stations. The largest increment of this warning and control program is for the first phase of the programed radar improvements. This package principally provides facilities at primary radar sites in the United States for the installation of high powered systems and long-range radars to provide a frequency diversity capability in the warning system. This is designed to improve identification capabilities as well as decrease enemy capabilities to effectively utilize electronic countermeasures against our radars. The construction involved in this type of radar improvement consists primarily of the procurement and installation of enclosed radar towers and provision of large quantities of electric power for operation of the newer high powered radars.

Several new installations are included within this category. They are as follows:

the requirements for 1 B-52 squadron plus associated tankers.

The fiscal year 1957 construction program provided construction at 11 additional existing Air Force bases, increasing the total B-52 bases programed to 22. In the basic fiscal year 1958 construction program, 5 more existing bases were expanded and adapted, making a total of 27 B-52 bases. The fiscal year 1958 supplemental program, approved by the committee last winter contained the first increment of construction to adapt an additional 6 existing bases which would provide the total 33 bases needed for B-52 squadron dispersal and their associated KC-135 jet refueling tanker aircraft.

The fiscal year 1959 construction program contains approximately \$66 million for additional facilities which will substantially complete current requirements for full dispersal of the 33 B-52 squadrons.

It has also been the objective of the Air Force to disperse the medium bombers on the basis of a single wing per base. Under present plans, the medium bomber force will be located on 20 bases at the end of fiscal year 1961. Construction of one of the bases, Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wis., was initiated with funds provided last year. This program contains \$13.2 million to provide a second increment of construction.

SAC tanker relocation: In the fiscal year 1958 supplemental program, authorization and funds were provided for construction which would permit the relocation of KC-97 tanker refueling squadrons from southern bases in the United States to locations in northern areas from which they can operate without delay in support of strike missions by the B-47 medium bombers. Against a current requirement to relocate 11 KC-97 squadrons, the fiscal year 1958 supplemental program provided the first increment of facilities for 9 squadrons on 8 existing bases.

The fiscal year 1959 program contains approximately \$33 million for additional short lead-time items for the first 9 squadrons and for the facilities needed to relocate a second squadron on 1 of the first 8 bases, increasing to 10 the number of squadrons relocated out of the 11-squadron requirement.

Construction is also included in this authorization bill for relocation of the 11th Squadron at Brunswick, Maine. This will permit the Air Force to deploy a KC-97 squadron at an existing naval installation on a tenant basis, and in accordance with a joint-use agreement.

Alert facilities: The advent of an enemy ICBM threat dictates the necessity for capability, after initial warning, of a 15-minute response by the SAC forces to insure their ability to survive and strike back. Under this objective, it is planned that one-third of the SAC forces will be maintained on continuous alert. The achievement of this capability requires construction of special facilities at the SAC bases.

Construction of base facilities which directly contribute to such an alert capability was initiated in the fiscal year 1957 military construction program. This initial construction consisted only of the provision of a certain portion of the aircraft parking apron in an alert configuration on those bases expanded for the dispersal of the heavy bomber squadrons where an additional parking apron was needed. Following this principle, alert parking areas were provided at 7 heavy bomber bases by the fiscal year 1957 MCP and at 5 more heavy bomber bases by the fiscal year 1958 MCP.

In addition to alert aircraft parking areas, ready crew and security facilities, and supporting utilities are needed for full alert capability. The fiscal year 1958 supplemental program authorized the first sizable construction increment for SAC alert, with \$24.6 million provided for construction of the first

Department	Name of installation	Location	Purpose
Air Force	Sundance Air Force Station	Sundance, Wyo.	Aircraft control and warning radar station.
Do.	Union City Air Force Station	Union City, Tenn.	Do.
Do.	Hastings Air Force Station	Hastings, Nebr.	Do.
Do.	Pickstown Air Force Station	Lake Andes, S. Dak.	Do.
Do.	Lompoc Air Force Station	Lompoc, Calif.	Do.
Do.	P-81a	Dallas Center, Iowa	Gap filler radar site.
Do.	P-34e	Alpena, Mich.	Do.
Do.	P-66b	Fibre, Mich.	Do.
Do.	P-66a	Grand Marais, Mich.	Do.
Do.	P-67b	Richlands Center, Mich.	Do.
Do.	P-20c	Marblehead, Ohio	Do.
Do.	P-31b	Brooks, Wis.	Do.
Do.	P-31d	Mones, Wis.	Do.

Ballistic missile detection system

While this bill contains no new request for the construction of ballistic missile detection facilities, the fiscal year 1958 supplemental bill authorized \$189 million for 3 sites. Inasmuch as ballistic missiles may have a trajectory as high as 400 to 700 miles, the radar stations to be established at these sites must have ranges of several thousand miles. It is estimated that stations planned, because of their requirement for maximum power and other highly complicated electronic gear, would cost close to a billion dollars.

All of these previously mentioned systems (DEW line, mid-Canada line, PINE TREE line, ballistic missile detection system) are to be closely integrated in the hope they will detect enemy aircraft and missiles in sufficient time to permit our own offensive and defensive forces to go into action before an attack reaches home.

RETALIATION CONCEPT

Strategic Air Command

Currently the Strategic Air Command in the Air Force is the principal element of our retaliatory forces. All construction costs pertaining to the Strategic Air Command cannot be readily identified in this bill because in many instances the Strategic Air Command would utilize bases other than its own such as Air Defense Command facilities.

However, the total program in the bill directly attributed to the Strategic Air Command, is close to \$200 million. Although

operational missiles are entering into our weapons inventory and promise tremendous additions to our military capabilities, our main offensive punch is still contained in the manned bomber forces of the Strategic Air Command with its fleets of heavy jet bombers, the B-52's, and the medium jet bombers, the B-47's.

The Soviets possess the advantage of initiative and surprise. Therefore, the Air Force must be capable of maintaining its strategic offensive force in the highest possible state of readiness with the least possible vulnerability to attack, and from which it can react rapidly upon receipt of tactical warning.

SAC's capability to launch its strike force in the event of a surprise attack is dependent upon four basic factors: (1) Warning; (2) alert facilities; (3) dispersal; and (4) personnel. For each of these factors, the availability of sufficient and proper facilities is a vital element in the attainment of the required degree of capability.

B-52 facilities and dispersal: To reduce the vulnerability and increase the response capability of the heavy bomber force, the Air Force, in fiscal year 1957, initiated a program to disperse the programed 33 B-52 squadrons on the basis of a single squadron per base. At that time, 11 bases, which had been the homes for the 11 B-36 wings, were available for adaption for use by the B-52's. Each of these 11 bases has been adapted, with some necessary additional construction, to

ready crew and alert facilities as well as alert pavements at additional bases for both medium bombers and heavy bombers.

The \$80.9 million included in this request for alert facilities together with certain alert facilities provided as part of the dispersal package, provides short lead-time items on certain bases where projects requiring longer times for construction were started in prior years' construction programs. In addition, it provides the full alert construction requirement at bases where no long lead-time construction is necessary. This fiscal year 1959 alert package substantially completes the construction needed for achievement of the 15-minute response capability as currently planned, except for aircraft shelters in northern areas, for which the requirement has not been finally determined.

Other strategic facilities: The remaining \$25.3 million under the strategic heading includes various operational and support facilities at overseas locations from which SAC units will operate or through which they will stage in wartime operations and at which they conduct peacetime maneuvers and rotation training missions. In addition, this package provides special ordnance storage facilities at SAC bomber bases in the United States.

Complete cost estimates for SAC to date were not available. It is estimated that approximately one-third of the Air Force budget for fiscal year 1958 and fiscal year 1959 is devoted to SAC.

Ballistic missiles

In the basic fiscal year 1958 and prior years' programs, authorization was provided for research, test, and training facilities at various locations for both the intercontinental and intermediate range ballistic missiles and to develop the first operational site for the Atlas ICBM at Cooke Air Force Base, Calif., and to initiate construction of a second operational site for the Atlas ICBM at Warren Air Force Base, Wyo.

The Atlas program has been accelerated by means of the fiscal year 1958 supplemental construction authorization which Congress approved earlier in this session. That construction program accelerated the completion date for the first operational site at Cooke and the operational facilities for the first squadron at Warren Air Force Base. The authorization provided by the fiscal year 1958 supplemental program also has been applied to the construction of facilities for additional Atlas squadrons.

It had been planned originally, under the fiscal year 1958 supplemental, to construct additional facilities at Warren Air Force Base for Atlas squadrons prior to proceeding with construction at additional sites. However, upon completion of the planning for these facilities, it was found that the construction activity which would be involved at Warren, was of such magnitude that it could not be efficiently or economically accomplished and that completion of operational facilities for these squadrons would be delayed. It was determined, therefore, that to provide a greater number of operational Atlas sites at earlier dates, it was necessary to initiate construction at additional sites. Under this plan, facilities are being provided simultaneously at Warren Air Force Base, Wyo.; Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr.; and Fairchild Air Force Base, Wash.

The largest package in the strategic portion of this fiscal year 1959 construction program provides \$165.9 million for ballistic missiles. This amount includes authorization for construction of operational Atlas facilities at one additional location, not yet firmly selected, and support facilities for both the previously programed and the new Atlas site. It also includes authorization for the construction of hardened facilities for the Titan ICBM. In addition, the fiscal year 1959 pro-

gram provides for construction of operational facilities for the intermediate range ballistic missile at overseas locations and for test and training facilities for both the ICBM and the IRBM at Cooke Air Force Base.

Other strategic missiles: \$29.6 million are included in the program for strategic missiles other than the ballistic type. This package contains facilities for the Hounddog and the Quail air-to-surface missiles carried by the Strategic Air Command B-47 and B-52 bombers to provide them with greater penetration capability. The package also provides facilities in the United States for the Goose which is a surface-to-surface air-breathing missile with an intercontinental range. Facilities for the Goose missile also were authorized in fiscal year 1958.

Snark

Also in the Strategic Air Command arsenal is the air-breathing intercontinental missile Snark which is capable of carrying nuclear warheads against distant targets with great accuracy. The first Snark unit has already been activated and is in the process of being manned and equipped. The first Snark missile base is being constructed at Presque Island, Maine. No new funds were requested in this year's bill for Snark facilities. The committee strongly questions this apparent diminishing of Snark's importance for the committee has become convinced that the addition of further Snark squadrons to our arsenal is highly desirable.

Navy contribution to retaliatory forces

It might well be said that the entire fleet at sea constitutes a most important segment of this Nation's strike capability. It is difficult to distinguish between categories of the Navy's capabilities due to the extreme flexibility and mobility inherent in modern naval forces. Especially worth mentioning is the Polaris missile being developed by the Navy which gives great promise of becoming one of the decisive weapons in the history of warfare. Certain funds are included in the bill for the construction of Polaris facilities; the details are classified. It is the committee's view, however, that the Department of Defense could well have requested additional authorizations for this weapon. It sincerely hopes that Department of Defense will provide the Navy with the highest priority in the development of Polaris and will remove any obstacles which might prevent the earliest possible deployment of the Polaris system in an operational configuration.

Jupiter

While Jupiter is an Army-developed weapon, its operational assignment has been given to the Air Force. It has similar characteristics to the Thor. Jupiter's success to date indicates that it apparently can be fully operational in the immediate future. The committee notes with interest and some concern, the duplication of effort between Jupiter and Thor. It can understand the need for some duplication in research and development. It cannot condone duplication in operational deployments. The committee certainly hopes the Secretary of Defense will, if this type of duplication is imminent, make a decision based on the relative merits of the two weapons and not on the understandable service pride in authorship.

DEFENSE CONCEPT

All weapons systems can rightly be cataloged in certain of their applications as supporting the concept of defense. In this report the committee directed itself only to those which pertain to the continental air defense field.

Under the command of the North American Air Defense Command (NORAD), Colorado Springs, Colo., there are assigned approximately 200,000 Americans and Canadians along with nearly 2,000 aircraft and hundreds of antiaircraft weapons. Predicated

upon the information flashed to NORAD by the warning system, the NORAD command control system depends upon the semiautomatic ground environment system (SAGE) and related facilities as a medium of controlling and coordinating its various weapons.

SAGE

The SAGE (semiautomatic ground environment) system, under present plans, involves the construction of technical and support facilities for 36 SAGE centers (computers) for 29 SAGE sectors (locations). SAGE centers 1 through 26 have been constructed or initiated with authorizations provided in the fiscal year 1958 supplemental and prior construction programs. The fiscal year 1959 authorization request includes \$41.1 million for technical facilities for SAGE centers 27 through 31, support facilities for centers previously authorized, and communications facilities at various radar sites to tie their operation into the automatic features of the SAGE system. It is estimated that the SAGE system will eventually cost approximately \$1 billion and require approximately \$400 million for its annual operation.

Joint manual direction centers: \$16.9 million are included in the program to provide the Air Force portion of a joint Army-Air Force operated missile defense center system inside the United States. Present plans call for a number of centers in this system, also known as the Missile Master, with the Air Force being the host at some centers, and the Army being the host at the other centers.

This authorization request will provide technical and support facilities at the Air Force locations and technical facilities only at the Army locations.

Fighter interceptors

There are approximately 70 squadrons of Air Force interceptors of 25 planes each assigned to NORAD. These consist of the F-100 series fighters with the old F-86 Sabrejet and the Lockheed F-94 Starfire being gradually phased out as newer planes are deployed. No specific overall cost estimation of the fighter-interceptor effort is available at the time of this printing. However, set out below are certain cost estimations from which some conclusions can be drawn.

[In millions]

One fighter-interceptor squadron	
INITIAL INVESTMENT	
Aircraft and spare parts.....	\$40.0
Equipment.....	.3
Facilities.....	25.0
Training.....	8.0
Total.....	73.3
ANNUAL COSTS	
Pay and personnel.....	\$5.0
Equipment replacement.....	2.0
Supply.....	3.0
POL.....	.5
Total.....	10.5

The committee has been informed that in all likelihood certain of the fighter-interceptor squadrons will be phased out as Bomarc is deployed.

Bomarc (IM-99)

Bomarc is a surface-to-air long-range interceptor guided missile of supersonic speed designed to operate at high altitudes. It is produced by Boeing Aircraft Co. It launches vertically and cruises on twin ramjet engines at a speed faster than sound. It is guided by the latest available electronic systems. Bomarc has been successfully tested in a series of firings from Patrick Air Force Base, Fla., against high-flying drone aircraft over the ocean. The Bomarc's range should enable it to destroy

enemy planes at a far greater distance than any other missile assigned to NORAD.

Ninety-two million dollars for the construction of Bomarc sites is included in the Air Force request (originally this amount was \$122 million but the Air Force revised its estimates). Construction of facilities for this missile was initiated in the fiscal year 1958 construction program at four locations: McGuire Air Force Base, N. J.; Suffolk County Air Force Base, N. Y.; Otis Air Force Base, Mass.; and Dow Air Force Base, Maine. The fiscal year 1959 request will add facilities at 10 additional locations: Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, N. Y.; Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Vt.; Kinross Air Force Base, Mich.; Duluth Municipal Airport, Minn.; Langley Air Force Base, Va.; Truax Field, Wis.; Paine Air Force Base, Wash.; Camp Adair Air Force Station, Oreg.; Travis Air Force Base, Calif.; and Cooke Air Force Base, Calif.

The committee estimates that if the Bomarc system is developed as currently envisaged, it may cost as much as—if not more than—\$6 billion.

Army air defense command

The Army's structure within the North American Air Defense Command is the second largest Army combat command in the world. It has been stated that approximately 7 to 10 percent of the entire Army effort is devoted to this activity. The basic weapons assigned or soon to be assigned to Army units are the Nike family (Ajax, Hercules, Zeus, and Hawk).

Nike-Ajax

Named after Nike, the Greek goddess of victory, the Nike-Ajax is a supersonic surface-to-air missile designed to intercept and destroy enemy aircraft or air-breathing missiles. It is the only fully operational surface-to-air missile system in the free world today. It uses a command guidance system employing one radar to track the target and another to track the missile. A computer receives data from the radar and calculates the commands required to bring the Nike into interceptor course.

Approximately 60 battalions of Ajax are now deployed around key industrial and highly populated strategic areas. Ajax is a missile about 20 feet long and 1 foot in diameter; uses a solid propellant booster and a liquid sustaining motor. There are approximately 100 officers and men in a Nike battery.

Nike is being superseded and replaced in part by Nike-Hercules.

Nike-Hercules

This is a further improvement on the original Ajax. It is a similar type missile and designed in similar type proportions. Its range and other operational characteristics are considerably better than Ajax, however. It is a dart-shaped missile, 27 feet long, assisted by a 14½-foot-long booster. It uses solid propellant throughout. It can carry an atomic warhead. It is produced through the combined efforts of Army Ordnance Corps, Western Electric Co., the Bell Telephone Laboratories, and the Douglas Aircraft Co., together with essential subcontractors.

If the Nike (Ajax and Hercules) systems are developed in accordance with certain existing plans, the committee estimates that the combined total cost will be in the neighborhood of \$6 billion.

Hawk

This is a missile designed to reinforce the low-altitude capability of our defense system. It is the only weapon capable of a low-altitude defense currently being placed in inventory. Hawk is also a supersonic surface-to-air guided missile with exceptionally high rate of fire and very short reaction time. It is designed not only to meet static situations but also deployment with tactical field forces.

It uses solid propellant, is approximately 16 feet long and 14 inches in diameter. The Raytheon Manufacturing Co., of Massachusetts, is the prime contractor with Northrup Aircraft, of California, as the major subcontractor.

Missile Master

Important to the control and operation of previously mentioned anti-aircraft missiles is the Missile Master, which is a combination of electronic computing equipment designed to coordinate large numbers of surface-to-air projectiles. By electronic means it converts target location to usable data and transmits rapidly changing information instantaneously to the various controlling locations.

As stated before, this year's construction authorization bill originally contained in the Army title a little better than \$137 million for facilities incident to the Nike-Ajax and Hercules, Hawk, and Missile Master.

Zeus

The Army has been assigned the responsibility of developing the anti-ballistic-missile missile. When developed, it is contemplated that it will be deployed around key installations both military and civil. Zeus is part of the Nike family.

This bill contains a request for authorizations in the amount of approximately \$30 million. It is estimated that perhaps the Zeus system will cost on the order of \$4 to \$5 billion when finally deployed and operational.

As can be seen by the foregoing, the effort and resources the country is putting into continental defense systems is tremendous and a little bit frightening. If all systems are fully developed and deployed, it would not be illogical to assume we might well find certain installations defended by fighter interceptors, Bomarc, Nike-Ajax, Nike-Hercules, Hawk, and Nike-Zeus, with their attendant Sage and Missile Master controlling systems.

The committee has become increasingly concerned over this potential duplication. While it compliments those who have developed these systems, for their ingenuity and dedication, it does not believe that all are essential. The committee is especially concerned about the heavy deployment of missiles requiring stockpiles of nuclear warheads immediately adjacent to heavy centers of population. It can understand the need to insure the protection of military bases where strike forces are stationed; it cannot understand the heavy concentration in industrial and heavily populated centers with the attendant publicity implying that the deployment of these weapons at such locations constitutes no hazard and provides complete security from attack.

Duplication of air defense weapons systems

The committee is, and has been for some time, greatly concerned about the possible duplication of weapons systems and their attendant excessive costs and waste of effort. As can be seen by the preceding paragraphs, the weapons in existence and being developed for the defense of the continental United States are many and varied. Two years ago, in the fiscal year 1957 military construction authorization bill, the committee was presented with requests for authorizations pertaining to construction of facilities for Nike-Ajax and Talos ground-to-air missiles. The Ajax was to be used in connection with the Army's point defense responsibilities, and the Talos was part of the Air Force area defense mission. At that time, the committee in its report, stated:

"The committee concluded that both the Army and the Air Force are assigned overlapping roles and missions in the anti-aircraft and continental air defense fields. While the Air Force views its mission as one of area defense, and the Army views its as perimeter

or point defense, it is clear that a definite and urgent need exists for the Department of Defense to quickly and positively clarify the specific responsibility of each service. The committee believes that unless concise responsibilities are assigned, duplication of weapons systems costing in the multibillion dollar range might result, and that such duplication would obviously be too costly as well as inexcusable from the military standpoint."

The committee then denied the authorization for the establishment of Talos sites and called upon the Secretary of Defense to make a determination. Subsequently in his memorandum of November 26, 1956, the Secretary of Defense assigned Talos to the Department of the Army.

The committee took the action of denying the authorization for Talos not because it believed that Talos was an ineffective weapon; on the contrary, testimony indicated that it gave promise of being ideally suited for a role in the air defense system. The committee felt then as it does now that Congress should not be called upon to make a determination between the relative merits of weapons systems each of which was strongly supported by its developers; that this was a responsibility that should be accepted by the Department of Defense.

In May 1958, the chairman of the committee received the following letter from the Department of the Army with reference to the future production of Talos:

MAY 2, 1958.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In conformance with the Department of the Army's policy to keep you and the members of your committee informed of Army affairs, it is desired to acquaint you with actions being taken concerning the land based Talos missile.

Based on the review and decision of higher authority not to employ the land based Talos system due to budgetary limitations, it became necessary for the Army to terminate the Talos production contract with RCA yesterday, May 1, 1958.

While this action results in termination of the manufacture of Talos land based systems, the production of certain components, basically computers and tracking radars, will be continued for utilization in the research and development areas on other Army programs.

Remaining in effect between RCA and the Army is the contract to complete evaluation of the Talos land based system. This evaluation is being performed on the R. & D. model installed at White Sands Proving Ground.

Sincerely,

J. H. MICHAELIS,
Major General, GS,
Chief of Legislative Liaison.

Even though qualified witnesses who appeared before the committee had stated that "Talos ranks with the best in air defense systems. This country needs all it can buy", the decision has now been reached that Talos is no longer required. Yet had the committee authorized the funds requested in the fiscal year 1957 military construction authorization bill, there can be no doubt that Talos site would now be established adjacent to Nike-Ajax installations.

Now a similar situation apparently exists with regard to Nike-Hercules and Bomarc. The same arguments exist regarding point and area defense. A glance at the classified deployments projected for these missiles indicates that in many, many instances it is planned to locate each in the same area for the purpose of defending the same installation. The committee has reviewed this subject most thoroughly—not only in this session but also during the 2 preceding years. Each service has defended its own program with honest vigor and conviction—yet it is

most obvious to the committee that the Army and the Air Force continue to have overlapping responsibilities in the air defense missile field—and that their respective programs duplicate each other.

The committee does not intend to imply that complete defense measures should not be taken for certain specified areas; but defense of the fortress or fixed position type can be carried to far, especially if the costs incident to the defensive system in any manner reduces the capacity of the strike forces. In fact, such a policy could well be fatal militarily and equally if not more important, from the economic standpoint.

In classified briefings, overlays shown of existing and planned defensive systems indicate the eventual deployment of at least four systems superimposed upon each other and blanketing the entire continent. While each system has its own special characteristics, these overlays clearly indicate areas of overlap where one system might well perform the function of its neighbor. Each of these systems is estimated to cost in excess of \$3 to \$4 billion (some, as shown before, as high as \$6 billion). Granted, these plans and proposed programs have not all received official OSD or JCS approval. Nevertheless, the committee's experience is that such programs have a habit of being approved by default through the medium of piecemeal submission on an annual basis without regard to the accumulation of long-range contingent liabilities. (In fact, the committee suspects that in some instances where the JCS cannot agree on duplicating systems, it slightly reduces each in scope and proceeds to develop both.)

It is the committee's firm and unanimous opinion that decisions must be made to eliminate duplication otherwise the annual cost of the defense budget will require increases beyond all reasonable proportions.

Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy indicated his thoughts concerning future Defense budgets as shown in the following excerpts from the published record of his press conference held on June 19, 1958, at Quantico, Va.:

"Mr. NORRIS (Washington Post). Could you indicate what size that budget is? There have been some reports that it would go up tremendously.

"Secretary McELROY. Well, there has been no approval of the budget by the administration as a whole.

"Mr. NORRIS. I mean the future trend.

"Secretary McELROY. Well, you mean how high it could ultimately—

"Mr. NORRIS. There have been reports that it would go up to 60 or 70 billion within a decade if you continued with the size of forces and all the programs.

"Secretary McELROY. I think that could well be.

"Mr. NORRIS. You think that could be?

"Secretary McELROY. Yes, I do.

"Mr. NORRIS. Does that—does the study show that?

"Secretary McELROY. No; we haven't gone that far. In fact, I don't think there is much use really in making a projection for 10 years ahead with technological advances proceeding as they do. That figure of 60 or 70 is in my opinion a pretty breezy figure, but I can tell you that it wouldn't be difficult for that kind of addition to have to be required if we continue with the size forces we have."

The committee feels that major policy decisions must be made immediately in order to establish how far the country should go in developing fixed defenses.

Last year, the committee stated: "The committee requests the Secretary of Defense to take vigorous action to insure that only those systems are approved and maintained that fit in with the overall strategic doctrine * * *." The committee feels that it is again pertinent to quote from Henry Kis-

singer's article in Foreign Affairs magazine of April 1957, entitled "Strategy and Organization":

"In the absence of a generally understood doctrine, all actions will of necessity prove haphazard; conflicting proposals will compete with each other without an effective basis for their resolution. Each problem, as it arises, will seem novel and energies will be absorbed in analyzing its nature rather than in seeking solutions. Our services will find it impossible to make a meaningful choice among the mass of the new weapons with which their research and development programs will soon overwhelm them. We will continue to cede the initiative to others and our course will become increasingly defensive."

Witnesses before the committee have indicated that if all the defense systems currently being contemplated by each service were to be established the total cost would be close to \$8 billion per year for the next 5 years and \$5 billion annually thereafter.

Secretary McElroy has stated, "The capital investment already made in this continental air-defense system during the last 4½ years exceeds \$13 billion. The cost of operation is now almost \$2 billion a year." Information in the committee files indicates that Secretary McElroy's figures may be on the low side. Nevertheless, they serve to show the order of magnitude.

Defense versus offense

It can be argued that "the country can never have enough defense" and that duplication of weapons systems is not really duplication, but provides necessary flexibility. The committee takes strong objection to this point of view. It is of the opinion that the best defense is still a strong offense.

Gen. Carl von Clausewitz, writing around 1812, lists in his Principles of War certain general principles for defense. Principle No. 6 states, in part:

"The fundamental principle is never to remain completely passive, but to attack the enemy frontally and from the flanks even while he is attacking us."

And again: "The art of entrenchment * * * shall serve the defender not to defend himself more securely behind a rampart, but to attack the enemy more successfully. This idea should be applied to any passive defense."

In his principle No. 7, von Clausewitz states in the first sentence:

"This attack from a defensive position can take place the moment the enemy actually attacks or while he is still on the march."

The second paragraph of his principle No. 13 states:

"If you remember * * *, the few defensive battles that have ever been won, you will find that the best of them have been conducted in the spirit of the principles voiced here. For it is the study of the history of war which has given us these principles."

Too great a defensive psychology can only result in a Maginot-line concept. Defensive operations, in the opinion of the committee, should not be hampered by the absence of initiative which the committee believes is inherent in fixed positions. The Maginot line proved this. In the committee's opinion that a 100-percent defensive psychology is a will-o'-the-wisp which has led nations committed to it, to defeat or bankruptcy or general war. We must certainly provide adequate defense for our striking or retaliatory forces, but we must establish our true defense on mobility, dispersal, striking power, and more important, diplomatic and military policies designed to prevent war; such cannot be divorced from economic stability.

In writing in 1949, Dr. Vannevar Bush, in Modern Arms and Free Men, had this to say on defense in a period of atomic stalemate:

"If at that time we tried to make our situation utterly immune we should certainly lose the race, for to seek utter immunity would take all of our resources for that purpose alone, and even then complete immunity would probably not be attainable. It will take resolution and calm thinking to hew to the line if that time comes. It will take a highly effective system of national military planning, a far better one than we have now."

He further states:

"The important points are, first, that we should never become so obsessed with a defense system as to invite disaster by relying upon it to the detriment of retaliatory striking power, and second, that such defensive measures as we take should be employed against specific, real threats and undertaken with proper timing."

COMMITTEE ACTION

In light of the foregoing, the committee has concluded we must place greater emphasis on our striking power and limited-war capabilities. We must make decisions to eliminate duplication in defensive weapons systems, and the defensive weapons systems which we retain should not be designed in the futile attempt to obtain 100-percent defense but rather to insure the security of our striking capability. The committee has reason to believe that it is not alone in this philosophy. Many witnesses appearing before the committee on other subjects have so indicated in response to questioning by committee members. When Gen. Carl Spaatz appeared before the full committee on July 9, in response to a request to testify on the Defense reorganization plan, the following colloquy took place:

"Senator STENNIS. Now, going to another subject of yours here, you mentioned these different weapons systems being stacked on top of one another, particularly with reference to the Nike group and Bomarc.

"We have before us now the military construction bill, General, that has the approval of the Budget Bureau and the approval of the Department of Defense, that carries with it the additional Nike sites, additional installations for that weapon, those batteries, and also the Bomarc, which is a related missile.

"It is similar, as you know, to what Talos was at one time.

"I personally think they ought to make a choice between those weapons, but I have a layman's attitude, not knowing anything about the military and I don't want to sit in judgment on matters from a military standpoint.

"But the Secretary of Defense now clearly has the authority, does he not, to make those choices, and hasn't he by virtue of the fact that he has already approved both of them?

"General SPAATZ. I would like to comment on that in this way: That if I, as a military man, would take those overlays and arrange these forces so there would be the minimum of duplication and the most effective possibility of use of all the weapons systems involved, that the rearrangement would result in quite a few military installations in the United States being cut out.

"Senator STENNIS. We had this up and it is going into large sums of money and we had it up last year and the year before and the various departments just stood toe to toe and said both systems were necessary, and it looked like duplication to us and we put out warning signs, but didn't feel that we were the ones to be the final judges.

"That was Talos and Nike and now Talos has passed out of the picture but Bomarc has come in and the question is still virtually the same as to which one is going to be used.

"General SPAATZ. Yes.

"Senator STENNIS. And they both run along together.

"General SPAATZ. Yes, sir. Of course, that is a decision that must be made in the Department of Defense."

Admiral Radford on the same date, in response to similar questions, had this to say, in part:

"Admiral RADFORD. I hesitate to call myself up to date on it. After all, I have been retired for nearly a year. But I would say that the subjects you have been discussing here today, the continental defense of the United States, is a field that has concerned me for a long time.

"I think that we have made plans that have become outmoded, but there is a great reluctance to change the plans or to eliminate something."

The committee has, therefore, taken the following action:

It will be remembered that \$137 million or 39 percent of the Army's authorization request pertains to construction of facilities for Nike-Hercules, Hawk, and Missile Master; and that \$92 million of the Air Force program pertains to Bomarc. The committee has deleted these two amounts from titles I and III of the bill, respectively, and has added the sum of \$183 million to title IV. This results in a reduction of the combined total request for Nike-Hercules, etc., and Bomarc by 20 percent, and authorizes the Secretary of Defense to construct for the Department of the Army or the Department of the Air Force such defense missile sites as he deems essential for the proper security of the Nation.

The 20 percent reduction was taken from the sum of the \$137 million Army figure and the \$92 million Air Force on the basis that it seems reasonable to assume that immediate and tangible savings can be effected in this area if a decision is made—as the committee expects.

When Secretary McElroy appeared before the full committee on the reorganization bill, he was questioned on this subject. He answered in part, stating:

"Referring to the continental defense picture which I have asked to be evaluated by the Weapons System Evaluation Group, which is the group of scientists who advise the Joint Chiefs and the Secretary. And this also has to do with a group of systems which appear to overlap in the continental defense picture."

The committee also notes with interest that Secretary McElroy in the minutes of the press conference held at Quantico, Va., on Thursday, June 19, 1958, indicated that this was an area where decisions had to be reached.

The committee expects him to make a choice. The committee is of the opinion that the adoption of one—with the resultant increased emphasis on it—while discarding another, could have the twofold effect of strengthening both our economy and our military posture.

In taking this action, the committee emphasizes that it is not establishing the precedent of making all authorizations or appropriations directly to the Secretary of Defense. On the contrary, it is simply carrying out prerogatives of Congress relative to its right to authorize and appropriate in specified areas. Nor should this action be taken to indicate in any manner that the committee believes that the Secretary of Defense does not already possess sufficient authority to make decisions in this field. In fact, during the reorganization hearings, Secretary McElroy was asked the following question (pertaining to the Nike, Talos matter): " * * * Why would it take so long to get a decision, and does this illustrate the kind of authority you were talking about needing?"

Secretary McElroy replied:

"I think it is something of an illustration although that authority, in my judgment remains with the Secretary under the previous legislation."

Nevertheless, it is clear that a final decision has not been reached, and the committee takes this action as a method of focusing the problem and in underlining its belief that Congress should not be called upon to determine the relative merits of competing military weapons systems.

In authorizing the status of the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) and recommending in this bill that ARPA be authorized \$50 million for construction of facilities pertaining to new weapons systems, the committee is further strengthened in the philosophy that the Secretary of Defense must make the decisions on new systems before they are presented to Congress. It might be said that Hercules and Bomarc are not new systems. Yet testimony taken by the committee indicates that Defense officials when they say "new systems," refer to missiles and other recent developments not considered as belonging in the conventional field. The following are extracts from the transcript of the committee's hearings on the reorganizational bill:

"Chairman RUSSELL. A provision to the bill gives the Secretary of Defense the authority to assign or to reassign to one or more departments or services the development and operational use of new weapons and weapons systems. Would you construe that proviso as an inferential limitation on your present authority or other authority contained in the bill to reassign the development and operational use of existing weapons or weapons systems?"

"Secretary McElROY. I had not thought of it as carrying that inference, Mr. Chairman. I believe that the reason for the inclusion of that provision by the House committee was in order that there should not be any inability on the part of the Secretary to move in assigning to an individual service the operational responsibility for new weapons, and that was given in the testimony as one of the problems, the lack of such authority was one of the problems, that had been involved in the proliferation of the entire missile production.

"I think without much doubt on the missile area we have produced more missiles than were needed and we have duplicated in ways which were wasteful of the taxpayers' money.

"If you will recall, the House committee and the House itself declined to grant the President's request for authority to consolidate functions, and I believe that the reason that this provision was made with respect to new weapons was that even though the denial was made of the right to consolidate functions, the assignment of new weapons was regarded as an important right for the Secretary to exercise.

"On the point of inferential denial of the right on other than new weapons, I had not thought that was true.

"May I ask Mr. Coolidge whether he has that feeling in looking at the language?"

"Mr. COOLIDGE. I consider that the doubt here was whether new weapons meant something that was not in existence at the date this act was passed, and I would construe that to be not so. What new weapons here would mean would be weapons that are non-conventional weapons. Missiles, for instance, would be new weapons even though they are in existence, and I think the Secretary is right that the House, when it limited so severely the power to abolish functions, wanted to make it clear that that would not be mechanics that the Secretary would have to go through in regard to these new or non-conventional weapons. I would suppose that it did not reflect on the power to do other transfer if he complied with the new sections in the House bill.

"The new sections in the House bill do limit the Secretary's power that he has under the existing law in that he has to wait for 30 days, if it is a noncombatant func-

tion, which he would not have to do under the existing law.

"I do not know whether that supplements the Secretary's answer, Mr. Chairman.

"Chairman RUSSELL. It all ties the question up with whether a weapon is a function, and it seems to me that this is a matter that ought to be clarified before this bill is enacted on the transfer of weapons systems.

"Mr. COOLIDGE. I suppose it comes in as a function in that the Army, for instance, has capability under its roles and missions of long-range artillery, and a missile can be certainly construed as long-range artillery, and to that extent the handling of a weapon might be said to be part of their combatant functions, but weapons themselves I would suppose are not functioned.

"Chairman RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, do you think that the bill as it is presently drafted and the power that it gives you with respect to research and development and the assignment of research and development would be sufficient to solve for the Congress the responsibility for any future waste and duplication in such fields as the missile field?"

"Secretary McElROY. I do not suppose it is possible to absolve Congress from having its share of responsibility in practically all of these matters, because Congress does have the responsibility for authorizing funds to finance them, and in the course of these money authorization bills, a thorough examination is made of all of our programs, so I doubt very much if there could be a complete absolution of any responsibility on the part of Congress.

"I do think this, however: That there should be a far more efficient application of administrative ability to avoid waste. We have recently been talking about some of these matters and feel that the problem begins at the time of the conception of a new weapon, when you start that initial feasibility study, and if you can control the development of the program at that stage and not let it get to the stage of at least partial production or the building up of plant facilities production, you can in my judgment very sharply reduce the wasteful use of funds.

"Chairman RUSSELL. I asked the question because power in a Government such as ours always assumes responsibility. If there is a vested power it is usually accompanied by an equivalent responsibility. There has been so much discussion about the responsibility for the waste that has occurred here before, I would assume that the consolidation of power that this bill carries, while it could not of course absolve Congress of the responsibility for appropriating and if we concentrate responsibility for waste and duplication, certainly it grants all the powers that Congress could possibly have to deal with that subject to the executive branch of the Government."

The committee reiterates that action taken herein is not a precedent for denying future authorizations and appropriations directly to the services. The committee believes that the identity of the services should be preserved—but not for the purpose of perpetuating duplication in instances where obviously a decision must be made.

LIMITED WAR CONCEPT

This is another area of controversy. Hardly any two authorities can agree on the proper definition of the subject. Nevertheless, all the services have, in their own manner, provided certain forces for the prosecution of military activities short of actual combat or of general war.

General Pate, Commandant of the Marine Corps, stated in part when testifying before the committee, "Thus, today the Corps is providing the first echelon of the Nation's limited war force." It may be stated here that Marine units seems to have proven this in their recent deployment to the Middle East.

The Army has established the Strategic Army Corps (STRAC) and its reinforcements.

STRAC is designed to be a mobile, combat-ready force to meet the initial requirements of limited war or provide initial reinforcements in the event of general war. It consists, at the present time, of four combat-ready divisions and essential combat and logistical support.

The Strategic Army Corps reinforcement in peacetime has a mission of augmenting the training base and providing a strategic reserve in time of emergency and in case of deployment of STRAC.

Any forces of these types cannot be effective unless they have strategic mobility; i. e., the availability of adequate air and sea lift. The Marines, as an integral part of the Navy have a built-in mobility the country is fortunate to possess (witness their immediate availability for deployment to Beirut). Both forces do not, in the opinion of the committee, possess sufficient airlift.

In fact, the committee is of the opinion that the airlift capability is most inadequate and cannot understand why, the Army, especially, has not sought with greater vigor to insure a capability of moving its troops and equipment by air or if it has requested such, why the Department of Defense has not taken affirmative action. Obviously, one requirement is the necessary funds. It has been reported that Army officials calculate the Army should have approximately 100 C-133 type turboprop transports available for such use. Each C-133 would cost in the neighborhood of \$8 million. The committee wonders why some of the money spent on fixed defenses to date has not been utilized for this purpose; for without mobility, ground forces have little opportunity of reaching vital areas in sufficient time to merit their existence.

The committee feels most strongly that the Department of Defense should maintain a greater vigilance in establishing "limited war" capabilities. It seems obvious that if the world's two greatest powers reach a nuclear stalemate wherein differences between them cannot be resolved except by resort to total war, that the situation may well indeed be similar to that described by the phrase, "of two scorpions in a bottle," i. e., mutual annihilation. If one assumes that nuclear stalemate can be reached, one must also assume the Soviet Union would then be free to again exercise the advantage of its great superiority in numbers and interior lines of communication and that it could proceed to disrupt the world by piecemeal tactics, subversion, and other pressures backed by the presence of its conventional forces (which, indeed, it did in Hungary and seems to be doing now).

In light of this, the committee wonders why the Army has placed such a great emphasis on fixed defense (point) weapons systems which the committee believes has caused a resultant diminution of its ground combat capability (its principal and most important mission). The committee believes the Army should take stock of itself and redirect its efforts toward providing the United States with the finest force in the world capable of victorious sustained ground combat; such would be consistent with its long and glorious history developed on many famous battlegrounds.

At this point, the committee wishes to especially compliment and commend the United States Marine Corps. All can be proud of the Marine Corps, its tradition, its valor, and its courage. The committee was particularly proud the day the Marine Corps witnesses appeared before it. All officials to that date had testified on the need for new weapons systems, better machines of war, and the highly complicated gadgets of modern electronics. A Marine general, in describing the Marines' concept of opera-

tions, was the only military man who, at the conclusion of his testimony, said in substance: "Regardless of our requests for facilities and weapons, I would like to point out that we leave such decisions to the committee; for the individual fighting marine is our greatest asset and as long as we can maintain him, we have few problems."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has asked me to yield so that he may introduce visitors from a foreign country.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE CABINET AND LEGISLATURE OF BRITISH GUIANA

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last fall it was my privilege to visit northern South America and to meet some of the people there. Today we have in the Chamber as our guests two distinguished visitors who are members of the Cabinet and Legislature of British Guiana.

I present to the Senate Dr. Cheddi Jagan, Minister of Trade and Industry, and Mr. Edward Beharry, Minister of Natural Resources.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). On behalf of the Senate, the Chair welcomes our distinguished visitors. It is a pleasure to have them with us.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 25. An act relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees;

S. 1782. An act for the relief of Carolina M. Gomes; and

S. 3817. An act to provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its Territories, and possessions by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2146) for the relief of William F. Peltier, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 10. An act to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals;

H. R. 7688. An act for the relief of Filbert L. Moore;

H. R. 9798. An act for the relief of the estate of John V. D'Alessandro;

H. R. 11921. An act for the relief of Aaron Green, Jr.;

H. J. Res. 652. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 653. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 659. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 660. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1884. An act for the relief of Jack Carpenter;

H. R. 1885. An act for the relief of Edwin Matusiak;

H. R. 2647. An act for the relief of D. S. and Elizabeth Laney;

H. R. 5062. An act for the relief of Albert H. Ruppard.

H. R. 5219. An act to provide tax relief to the Heavy and General Laborers' Local Unions, 472 and 172, of New Jersey, pension fund and the contributors thereto;

H. R. 5441. An act for the relief of Scott Berry; and

H. R. 8015. An act for the relief of the Harmo Tire & Rubber Corp.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 10. An act to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 7688. An act for the relief of Filbert L. Moore;

H. R. 9798. An act for the relief of the estate of John V. D'Alessandro;

H. R. 11921. An act for the relief of Aaron Green, Jr.;

H. J. Res. 652. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 653. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 659. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 660. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as I understand, the bill is now open to amendment. I send to the desk amendments which have been requested by the committee. After the amendments have been stated, I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 98, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "Sec. 110," and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 109."

On page 153, at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "give full consideration to all elements of value in accordance with existing law, and shall."

On page 155, to strike out line 16 and insert in lieu thereof: "in which a final adjudication of just compensation has not been made on the date of enactment of this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments offered by the Senator from Mississippi will be considered en bloc.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if there is no objection, the Senate might vote on these amendments.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President—

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for another of his very able, carefully analyzed presentations in the field of military construction. He and the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], together with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], have done magnificent work on the bill.

Speaking as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am very pleased to see the bill presented in this fashion on the floor. I especially commend the Senator from Mississippi for the amount of time and judgment which he and his committee devoted to the questions of how much money should go into the strictly defensive weapons systems, such as Nike, Talos, Hawk, and Bomarc.

Unfortunately, I was not able to be on the floor during all of the presentation made by the Senator from Mississippi, but it is my understanding that this defensive missile subject was covered extensively in his remarks. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. That subject was covered somewhat, although not so extensively as in the report. I may say that the counsel, advice, and guidance of the Senator from Missouri has been very helpful to the committee. It has strengthened us in our position with reference to these many matters.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator. Any compliment from him is always especially appreciated.

I again wish to emphasize the importance of what the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has said with respect to the relatively large amount of money we are spending for passive defense as against what we are spending to equip and support our troops all over the world.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a portion of the report which appears on pages 54 and 55 and relates to the air space problem.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a result of General Quesada's investigation, he wrote the committee a letter on June 16, 1958 (a full copy of this letter will be found at the appendix of the printed testimony), salient features of which are printed below:

Your committee's desires for early action prompted me to explore in some detail two logical possibilities:

First—what action can be taken now, this week, to alleviate the congestion, and improve the air traffic safety features, and

Second—what interim steps can be taken between now and the time an expanded Andrews facility can accept additional aircraft.

In the first instance, I would like to list for the committee's information action on the part of the Air Force and the Navy at Bolling and Anacostia that will be taken immediately to reduce the volume of operations at those bases. This action is a direct result of your committee's request for the study.

1. An agreement between Anacostia, Bolling, and Washington National towers to separate the traffic from those bases has been amended as of June 10. The amended agreement further confines military VFR traffic operating to and from Bolling and Anacostia to two definitely prescribed corridors or tunnels from which they may not deviate. These tunnels will keep Bolling and Anacostia aircraft east of the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers and will prevent them from mixing with aircraft operations at Washington National Airport. I would like to insert a copy of the amended agreement for the RECORD.

2. Both bases are completely closed to jet aircraft and the six jets previously stationed at Anacostia are now grounded, and will be transferred to Andrews.

3. All transient aircraft at Bolling and Anacostia will be restricted to official business only.

4. Flights emanating from Bolling and Anacostia will leave the vicinity of Bolling-Anacostia until the flight is to be terminated.

5. Bolling and Anacostia pilots will make increased use of instrument flight plans to the extent that they can be accommodated by the air-traffic control system.

6. All Reserve squadrons at Anacostia will be scheduled to perform their yearly 2 weeks of active training duty at other bases throughout the country where less air traffic congestion exists and not at Anacostia. There are no Air Force Reserve squadrons based at Bolling.

It is anticipated that the above actions and restrictions will reduce the annual operations at Bolling and Anacostia by about 20,000 movements, or by about 25 percent.

My investigation into the possible immediate transfer of aircraft from Bolling and Anacostia to other military bases until Andrews is ready led me to two basic considerations. First, it was necessary to find military bases within 200 miles of Washington which could accept and support additional piston aircraft of the types now based at Bolling and Anacostia. Second, we had to explore the impact the remote location of aircraft would have upon the complicated scheduling of pilots, aircraft, and missions.

To physically accept additional aircraft, a remote base must have adequate runway, ramp, and parking space. The base would have to be so located that the introduction of additional operations would not aggravate an already congested airspace and air-traffic-control situation.

Before transferring Bolling and Anacostia aircraft, provision must be made for transfer and housing of maintenance and other support personnel, for storing and testing space engines, radios, and various other aircraft components.

On the basis of data I have been able to develop in the preparation of this report for your committee, I recommend:

1. Expedited action to immediately enlarge the ground, navigation, communications, and landing facilities at Andrews Air Force Base and Patuxent River Naval Air Station. This action is absolutely essential to realizing the maximum safe utilization of the airspace and airports in the National Capital region.

2. The expansion at Andrews be so staged that homogeneous units of Bolling and Anacostia aircraft can transfer to Andrews at the completion of each specific stage.

3. That any increase in the civil air traffic into the Washington National Airport be carefully reviewed until such time as this air-traffic congestion has been alleviated by the completion of the airport now planned at Chantilly. For example, initial operations of commercial jets serving the Washington area will be operated from Friendship Airport, near Baltimore, until adequate facilities are available at Chantilly.

4. Continued effort on the part of the Navy, the Air Force, and civil operators to explore ways and means to further reduce the number of aircraft operations at Bolling, Anacostia, and National Airport.

The committee wishes to compliment and thank General Quesada for his assistance. It cannot help but feel, however, that it is incumbent upon the services to continue to pursue the subject most vigorously—even if it means drastically curtailing proficiency flights in areas where civilian aircraft must operate. It becomes increasingly obvious that a solution must soon be found to the airspace congestion which has resulted in so many tragic fatalities in the past few months. The committee cannot help but feel that many of these tragedies could have been avoided. The committee includes these remarks in this report on the construction bill in order to emphasize the problem and to indicate that it expects the Secretary of Defense to move with all possible speed in expediting the construction of facilities at Andrews Air Force Base and also to insure that the establishment of other military facilities throughout the country is coordinated in light of the airspace problem.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this portion of the report pertains to the work which General Quesada did for the subcommittee in connection with the very serious problem involving the congested air space surrounding Washington National Airport. We have two items in the bill for the construction of additional facilities at the Andrews Air Force Base to take care of traffic from Bolling and Anacostia Naval Training Stations.

We thought the General did some very constructive work, and in our report we urged the Secretary of Defense to speed up and expedite the construction program at Andrews Air Force Base, as well as to do anything further that he may have reason to do which would lessen the intensity of the air traffic pattern around the Washington National Airport.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment at the proper time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield first to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which

I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania will not be in order until the amendments submitted by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] have been acted on.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Mississippi, which, without objection, will be considered en bloc.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, may we have a further explanation of the amendments? I think they are all right.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the amendments are very largely technical in nature. The major one is with reference to the Wherry housing program, which was discussed somewhat at length.

On page 153, in line 25, there appear the words:

Give full consideration to all elements of value in accordance with existing law.

We decided that provision to be a little too tight. We merely propose to strike out those words, so as to leave the matter an open judicial question.

Mr. CAPEHART. I see no objection to the amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Indiana.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Mississippi, which, without objection, are being considered en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania will now be stated.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** On page 169, between lines 13 and 14, it is proposed to insert "Johnstown, Pa.: Training facilities, \$375,000."

On page 176, in line 20, it is proposed to strike out "\$28,330,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$28,705,000."

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, this amendment is for the inclusion of an additional project for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, namely, the National Guard Armory at Johnstown, Cambria County, in the amount of \$375,000.

This proposed project will house the 628th Tank Battalion, 28th Infantry Division, Pennsylvania National Guard. The battalion, one of the largest in the State, has a strength of 24 officers, 4 warrant officers, and 462 enlisted men. It was organized in 1949, and was called into active duty in September 1950, at the outbreak of hostilities in Korea.

Several years ago, Bethlehem Steel Co. was prepared to deed a piece of property to the Commonwealth, for the purpose of providing an armory site; and the Federal Government had appropriated its share for the erection of this building. Since the State failed to appropriate its share of the funds, and accept the deed, the Federal Government withdrew its share of funds in 1955.

As a result, the local Lions Club, in conjunction with the Johnstown Chamber of Commerce, and the officers and men of the 628th, in the fall of 1955,

took on the task of soliciting the business houses and area residents, to raise the sum of \$10,000, and purchased 15 acres of ground in the vicinity of Johnstown. The deed was presented to, and accepted by, the Commonwealth in June 1957. Pennsylvania has now appropriated its 25 percent share toward the construction of this armory, and has placed it on a priority basis. If the 75 percent appropriation were made available, it would become a reality.

I have been repeatedly asked by the local residents and heads of the civic organizations promoting this drive toward purchase of the ground, as to when they are going to build the armory.

The scope of this project and its priority are of great significance. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that Johnstown is located in a critical unemployment area, and it was certified as a critical distressed area by the Labor Department. If the Johnstown armory were authorized at this time, it would help in relieving the unemployment problem. Its construction would not only help place many men at work, but it would also have far-reaching advantages for the local business climate, the community, and its populace.

Mr. President, there are sufficient holdover funds for the construction of the Johnstown National Guard Armory, and I trust that this body will approve my amendment.

Mr. President, I should like to add that this unit a part of the 28th Division. The 28th Division and its predecessors have taken part in all our wars from the Revolutionary War to the present time.

Recently, when the Department of Defense was naming the infantry divisions of the National Guard which would be reorganized under the new plan of organization, of the 6 named, the 28th Division was 1.

Furthermore, Johnstown has twice in its history been practically wiped out by floods; but it has always come back. At the present time, it is backing this unit in magnificent fashion.

Mr. President, I am most appreciative of the fine report the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has made, but I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that wars are won on the ground. We may appropriate large sums of money to make possible travel to the moon; but the defense of our country is based largely on the use of ground troops.

So I sincerely trust that the Senate will accept my amendment, and that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]—and again I say I appreciate very much the fine report he has made—will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the **RECORD** an editorial—published on July 24 in the **Pittsburgh Post-Gazette**—which quotes Governor Leader, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, on the importance of the National Guard.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the **RECORD**, as follows:

KEEP THE GUARD STRONG

With the Nation again in a tense international situation, Governor Leader has chosen an appropriate time to protest any reduction in the size of the National Guard. He has heartily concurred in a proposal which the Conference of Governors sent to the Army to assure "in the Pennsylvania National Guard the retention of the maximum number of units and personnel within the modern Army concept."

Governor Leader makes out a good case for the guard. In time of peace no less than in time of war, he argued, the guard plays an important role. Aside from being ready for the prompt defense of the Nation, it gives effective service in such peacetime disasters as hurricanes, floods, and storms.

The guard provides a ready source of trained manpower at an annual cost of only \$835 per guardsman as compared with the \$5,000 a year it costs to maintain a soldier in the regular Military Establishment.

It would be foolish economy and a grave risk to the Nation's security to impair the effectiveness of the National Guard. We are glad to see a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee vote against the administration's request to reduce the size of the National Guard from 400,000 to 360,000 men. Let's keep the guard strong.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, in view of the enormous cost of defense, we must do all we can to build up the Reserve components, the civilian components, of our defense, which cost probably not more than one-tenth of what the regular establishment costs.

In my opinion, the question of the cost of the Government of the United States is much more serious than any military defense proposal that is confronting us.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania has made a very strong appeal for the adoption of his amendment, and his remarks are very persuasive. We know there is a great deal of merit to the amendment he has submitted, and the committee wishes it could join him in urging the adoption of the amendment, for the reasons he has stated.

However, the list of items included in the bill was received from the States, from the State National Guards, through their adjutants general, and was approved in Washington, through the National Guard Bureau.

On page 110 of the report, the following appears for Pennsylvania:

Army National Guard: Bethlehem, Carlisle, Chester, Ligonier.

We accepted the list which was submitted by the adjutant general of the State of Pennsylvania, as we did in the case of all the other States. So they are priority lists, and I do not think we could have a better guide. We accepted the lists from all the States, without exception.

Many other strong representations and recommendations have been made in regard to proposals for other States; but unless the items were included in the list provided by the State's adjutant general, we have not included them in the bill.

However, the bill contains an item which may be helpful to the Senator from Pennsylvania. Of course, the situations change from time to time, and plans at the State level are changed from time to time. Sometimes funds which were expected to be available do not materialize. So we have included in the bill a provision to the effect that up to 10 percent of the authorizations is to be available for additional projects. But, again they will have to come from the State level. So if there is a change for some reason and the authorities in Pennsylvania see fit to include the item in place of one on their list, there is authority in the bill to have such a situation taken care of. In that way we permit meritorious cases to be submitted, but it will still have to be done by the State authorities.

With that set of facts, we hope the Senate will not accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee substitute, as amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is absent by leave of the Senate attending the 49th Congress of the Interparliamentary Union at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL] are absent because of official business having been appointed by the Vice President to attend the 49th Congress of the Interparliamentary Union in Rio de Janeiro.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is absent by leave of the Senate because of death in his family.

If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—80

Aiken	Flanders	McNamara
Allott	Frear	Morton
Anderson	Goldwater	Mundt
Barrett	Hayden	Murray
Beall	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bennett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bible	Hruska	Pastore
Bricker	Humphrey	Potter
Bridges	Ives	Proxmire
Bush	Jackson	Revercomb
Butler	Javits	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carroll	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Jordan	Smathers
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Church	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Clark	Knowland	Sparkman
Cooper	Kuchel	Stennis
Cotton	Langer	Symington
Curtis	Lausche	Talmadge
Dirksen	Long	Thurmond
Douglas	Magnuson	Thye
Dworshak	Malone	Wiley
Eastland	Mansfield	Williams
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Young
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—16

Byrd	Hoblitzell	Payne
Case, S. Dak.	Holland	Purtell
Fulbright	Kennedy	Watkins
Gore	McClellan	Yarborough
Green	Monroney	
Hennings	Morse	

So the bill (H. R. 13015) was passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment,

request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 495) to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1411) to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. REES, and Mr. CORBETT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6239) to amend sections 1461 and 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WALTER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. CHELF, Mr. HILLINGS, and Mr. HYDE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 985) to provide that chief judges of circuit and district courts shall cease to serve as such upon reaching the age of 75.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3571. An act for the relief of Boris F. Navratil;

H. R. 8997. An act for the relief of Bunge Corp., New York, N. Y.;

H. R. 9765. An act for the relief of Mr. Marion S. Symms;

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for holding a White House Conference on Aging to be called by the President of the United States before September 30, 1960, to be planned and conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with the assistance and cooperation of other departments and agencies represented on the Federal Council on Aging; to assist the several States in conducting similar conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging; and for related purposes;

H. R. 12944. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kunigunde Beldie; and

H. R. 13482. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued August 1, 1958
For actions of July 31, 1958
85th-2d, No. 130

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	7,12	
Atomic energy.....	14	
Budgeting.....	16	
Butter.....	21	
Committee assignments...	12	
Commodity exchange.....	3	
Conservation.....	32	
Cotton.....	1	
Electrification.....	9,28	
Ethics.....	27	
Expenditures.....	24	
Farm program.....	1,26	
Fish.....	18	
Forestry.....	8,20,30	
Hog cholera.....	35	
Housing.....	2	
Information.....	17	
Legislative program..	15,25	
Margarine.....	21	
Military construction...	6	
Milk.....	34	
Onion futures.....	3	
Personnel....	4,19,23,27,33	
Public debt.....	24	
REA.....	22	
Small business.....	10,29	
Surplus commodities.....	13	
Transportation.....	5,31	
Water.....	18	
Watersheds.....	11	
Wildlife.....	18	

HIGHLIGHTS: House subcommittee ordered reported cotton amendments to farm bill. Senate passed bills to: Provide accrued expenditure budgeting. Regulate withholding of information by agencies. Senator Humphrey criticized GAO ruling on REA loan authority. House committee ordered reported omnibus housing bill.

HOUSE

1. FARM PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the Subcommittee on Cotton of the Agriculture Committee "met in executive session on provisions relating to cotton in S. 4071, re marketing programs for various agricultural commodities, and ordered reported to the full committee certain amendatory recommendations of the bill." pp. D770-71
2. HOUSING. The Banking and Currency Committee ordered reported with amendment S. 4035, the omnibus housing bill. p. D771
3. ONION FUTURES. Conferees agreed to file a conference report on H. R. 376, to prohibit trading in onion futures and remove onions from regulation under the Commodity Exchange Act. p. D771
4. PERSONNEL. A subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 9407, to provide additional opportunity for certain employees to obtain career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive service. p. D771

5. **TRANSPORTATION.** The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported with amendment H. R. 474, to repeal Sec. 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 relating to the coordination of the forwarding and servicing of water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the U. S. (H. Rept. 2332), and H. R. 8382, to provide for the licensing of independent foreign freight forwarders (H. Rept. 2333) p. 14493
6. **MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.** Conferees were appointed on H. R. 13015, to authorize construction at military installations. Senate conferees have ~~not~~ been appointed. p. 14397
- Both Houses
7. **APPROPRIATIONS.** /agreed to the conference report on H. R. 12948, the D. C. appropriation bill for 1959, and insisted on its disagreement to two of the Senate amendments. pp. 14397-98, 14384, 14388-90. Ready for the President. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 12738, the Defense Department appropriation bill for 1959. Senate conferees have not been appointed. p. 14398
8. **FORESTRY.** Conferees were appointed on S. 3051, to provide for either private or Federal acquisition of that part of the Klamath Indian forest lands which must be sold. Senate conferees have been appointed. p. 14445
9. **ELECTRIFICATION.** The Public Works Committee was granted permission until midnight Fri., Aug. 1, to file a report on S. 1869, to provide TVA with the authority to issue bonds to finance the construction of new generating capacity. pp. 14485, 14490
10. **SMALL BUSINESS.** Rep. Kilburn was relieved as a conferee on S. 3651, to make equity capital and long-term credit more readily available for small-business concerns, and Rep. Betts was appointed in his place. p. 14485
11. **WATERSHEDS.** The Public Works Committee approved work plans for the following watershed projects: Alamo Arroyo and Diablo Arroyo, Tex.; Elm River, N. Dak.; Mud River, Ky.; Trampers Creek, N. Mex.; Dry Devils River, Lowery Draw, and Upper Lake Fork Creek, Tex.; Lower Willow Creek, Mont.; Whitegrass-Waterhole Creek, Okla.; and Little Schuylkill River, Pa. pp. 14445, 14493
12. **COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS.** Rep. Coudert resigned as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and Rep. Lipscomb was elected in his place. p. 14490
13. **SURPLUS COMMODITIES.** Both Houses received from this Department the monthly report of the General Sales Manager regarding sales of CCC surplus commodities. pp. 14492, 14342
14. **ATOMIC ENERGY.** Both Houses received the semiannual report of the Atomic Energy Commission. pp. 14492-93, 14342
15. **LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM.** Rep. McCormack announced that the Private Calendar will not be called Tues., Aug. 5. p. 14485

SENATE

16. **BUDGETING.** Passed, 68 to 6, as reported H. R. 8002, the accrued expenditures budgeting bill (pp. 14390-5).
- As passed by the Senate, the bill provides as follows: When the President determines that there is a satisfactory accrual-accounting system for an appropriation or fund account, his estimates shall be accompanied by a proposed accrued-expenditures limitation, and he may include proposed authorizations for

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, JULY 31, 1958

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:
Isaiah 43: 5: *Fear not, for I am with thee.*

Most merciful and gracious God, we beseech Thee to be patient and favorable unto these Thy servants.

Give them grace to discharge their duties and responsibilities with a pure and steadfast devotion.

In all humility we are asking Thee to gird us with a faith which never fails and a courage that never falters.

May Thy righteous will have the place of preeminence in all our plans and purposes, our deliberations and decisions.

Temper our minds with patience and perseverance, and with a deep sympathy and concern for all who are seeking the blessings of the more abundant life.

In Christ's name we offer our petition. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 12738. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. FLANDERS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 13015. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, BROOKS of Louisiana, KILDAY, DURHAM, RIVERS, ARENDS, GAVIN, WILSON of Indiana, and Mrs. ST. GEORGE.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate while the House is in session today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate while the House is in session today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 12948) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 30, 1958.)

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 2, line 2, strike out "\$20,000,000" and insert "\$21,500,000."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 1.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: On page 18, line 7, after the semicolon, insert "expenses of attendance of one person, without loss of pay or time, at specialized traffic engineering classes, including tuition and entrance fees."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 13 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 18, line 18, after "appropriation", insert "Provided further, That the Commissioners are authorized and empowered to pay the purchase price and the cost of installation of new parking meters or devices from fees collected from such new meters or devices, which fees are hereby appropriated for such purposes."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 16, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 19, line 4, after the word "including", strike out "expenses of attendance of one person, without loss of pay or time, at specialized traffic engineering classes, including tuition and entrance fees."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 19, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 19, line 13, strike out, "That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be expended for building, installing, and maintaining streetcar loading platforms and lights of any description employed to distinguish same, except that a permanent type of platform may be constructed from appropriations contained in this act for street improvements when plans and locations thereof are approved by the Public Utilities Commission and the Director of Vehicles and Traffic and the street railway company shall after construction maintain, mark, and light the same at its expense."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 19, line 22, strike out "Provided further, That the Commissioners are authorized and empowered to pay the purchase price and the cost of installation of new parking meters or devices from fees collected from such new meters or devices, which fees are hereby appropriated for such purpose: *Provided further.*"

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 22, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 29. Page 32, line 25, after the word "adjustment", insert "Provided further, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be expended for building, installing, and maintaining streetcar loading platforms and lights of any description employed to distinguish same, except that a permanent type of platform may be constructed from appropriations contained in this act for street improvements when plans and locations thereof are approved by the Public Utilities Commission and the Department of Highways and the street-railway company shall after construction maintain, mark, and light the same at its expense."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 29, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 31. Page 38, line 6, after "1945", insert "Provided, That leases for rentals shall be on terms and periods not in excess of 5 years."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 31, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Provided, That hereafter leases for rentals shall not be on terms and periods in excess of 5 years."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations may have permission to sit tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. PHILBIN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 147]

Andersen,	Hosmer	Poage
H. Carl.	Jackson	Powell
Bass, Tenn.	Jenkins	Preston
Boggs	Jones, Mo.	Radwan
Bonner	Kearney	Sadlak
Burdick	Keating	St. George
Carnahan	Krueger	Scherer
Christopher	Landrum	Scrivner
Clark	Lesinski	Shuford
Dies	Loser	Sieminski
Diggs	McCarthy	Smith, Kans.
Eberharter	McIntire	Talle
Feighan	McMillan	Taylor
Friedel	Machrowicz	Tollefson
Gordon	Magnuson	Trimble
Gregory	Marshall	Tuck
Hays, Ark.	Michel	Willis
Hoffman	Morris	
Horan	Moulder	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 12738) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes,

with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, SHEPPARD, SIKES, NORRELL, WHITTEN, CANNON, WIGLESWORTH, SCRIVNER, FORD, and TABER.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1958

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 653 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13549) to increase benefits under the Federal Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance System, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds of such System, and otherwise improve such System; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child health and welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

(Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 653 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 13549, the Social Security Amendments of 1958. The resolution provides for a closed rule, 4 hours of general debate, and waives points of order against the bill.

The bill will increase benefits to approximately 12 million people now on the benefit rolls, and all future beneficiaries, about 7 percent, with a minimum increase of \$3 in the benefits payable to retired workers who came on the rolls at or after 65 years of age. For retired workers now on the rolls monthly payments would range from \$38 to \$118 as compared with \$30 to \$108.50 under present law. The bill would also raise the present \$200 limitation on family benefits to \$254 in the amount of monthly benefits payable to a family on the basis of an insured worker's earnings record.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported without amendment S. 4009, to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the Washoe reclamation project, Nev. and Calif., and with amendment S. 3448, to permit the Secretary of the Interior to authorize increases in the 160-acre limitation on the Seedskadee Reclamation project. p. D789

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 13523, to authorize the construction and maintenance by Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas reclamation project (H. Rept. 2427). pp. 14768-69

12. WHEAT; CORN MEAL. Passed without amendment H. R. 13268, to authorize CCC to purchase flour and corn meal for donation instead of having such products processed from its own stocks. pp. 14691-92
13. DESERT-LAND ENTRIES. Passed with amendments S. 359, to permit desert land entries on disconnected tracts of land aggregating less than 320 acres and form a compact unit. p. 14696
14. TRANSPORTATION. Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 8382, to provide for the licensing of independent foreign freight forwarders (pp. 14747-48); and H. R. 474, to repeal Sec. 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 relating to the coordination of the forwarding and servicing of water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the U. S. (p. 14748).
15. FRUITS AND NUTS. Voted 40 to 33 to suspend the rules and pass H. R. 11056, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act so as to extend restrictions on certain imported citrus fruits, dried fruits, walnuts, and dates. At the request of Rep. McCormack further consideration of the bill was postponed until Wed., Aug. 6. pp. 14754-60
16. WATERSHEDS. Received from the Budget Bureau plans for works of improvement pertaining to the following watersheds: Furnace Brook-Middle River, Conn. and Mass.; Busseron, Ind., and Crooked Creek, Iowa; to Agriculture Committee. p. 14768
17. RADIO FREQUENCIES. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendments S. J. Res. 106, to establish a commission to investigate the utilization of the radio and television frequencies allocated to agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government (H. Rept. 2355). p. 14768
18. SALINE WATER. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported with amendment S. J. Res. 135, to provide for the construction of demonstration plants for the production, from saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial and consumptive uses. p. D789
19. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Conferees agreed to file a conference report on H. R. 13015, the military construction authorization bill. p. D790
20. PERSONNEL. Passed over, at the request of Rep. Ford, H. R. 1168, to restore the pay of officers or employees to the level of the grade held before downgrading in certain cases. p. 14684

SENATE

21. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Proxmire criticized the cost of the present price support farm program and inserted an economic analysis of the cost of his bill, S. 2952, which concluded that it would be less expensive than the present program. pp. 14642-3

22. RESEARCH. Passed as reported S. 4039, to authorize the head of any Government agency now making contracts for research to grant funds for the support of such research. pp. 14623-4
23. PERSONNEL. Passed as reported H. R. 7710, to provide for the lump sum payment of all accumulated and accrued annual leave of deceased employees. p. 14626
24. MINERALS. At the request of Sen. Talmadge, passed over S. 4146, to provide for incentive payments for the production of certain minerals. p. 14626
The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. Res. 225, to extend until Jan. 31, 1959, the time for filing a report on the study of strategic raw materials in the Western hemisphere (S. Rept. 2175). p. 14546
25. FISHERIES; EXTENSION SERVICE. Passed as reported S. 2973, to establish a fishery extension service in the Fish and Wildlife Service to carry out co-operative fishery extension work with the States. pp. 14627-8
26. FORESTRY. Passed without amendment the following bills:
S. 3682, to authorize the Secretary to convey certain national forest lands in Ariz. to the Univ. of Ariz. p. 14629
H. R. 6038, to authorize transfers of land between the Sequoia National Forest and the Kings Canyon National Park, Calif. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 14630
H. R. 6198, to authorize the transfer of not more than 10 acres of land from the Sequoia National Park to the Sequoia National Game Refuge in Sequoia National Forest, Calif. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 14630
The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. 4053, to extend the boundaries of Siskiyou National Forest (S. Rept. 2171). p. 14546
27. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Began debate on S. 4162, to provide for the cancellation of certain uncollectible loans and operating losses under Title III of the Defense Production Act, to increase (in effect) the borrowing authority for the defense stockpile \$300 million. pp. 14631-2, 14644-50
28. MONOPOLIES. At the request of Sen. Talmadge, passed over S. 11, to amend the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity. p. 14618
29. WATER RESOURCES. At the request of Sen. Talmadge, passed over S. 3185, to promote fish and wildlife conservation by requiring prior approval by the Secretary of the Interior of licenses issued under the Federal Power Act. p. 14623
30. ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment H. R. 6788, to authorize the abbreviation of the record on the review or enforcement of orders of administrative agencies by the courts of appeals and the review or enforcement of such orders on the original papers and to make uniform the laws relating thereto (S. Rept. 2129). p. 14545
31. TOBACCO. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. Res. 334, to direct the committee to study marketing practices relative to loose and tied tobacco (S. Rept. 2163); which was then referred to the Rules and Administration Committee. p. 14546
The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12840, to provide a single acreage allotment for Va. sun-cured and Va. fire-cured tobaccos if farmers vote approval in a referendum (S. Rept. 2162) p. 14546

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

AUGUST 5, 1958.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. VINSON, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 13015]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,697,000.

Detroit Arsenal, Michigan: Administrative facilities, \$5,666,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$8,529,000.

Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois: Operational and training facilities, \$570,000.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, research, development and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$7,931,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$4,630,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Army Chemical Center, Maryland: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Troop housing, \$795,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$9,098,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Army Map Service, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, \$1,913,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,634,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Troop housing, \$862,000.

FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, \$171,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Troop housing and utilities, \$3,749,000.

(Second Army Area)

Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: Hospital facilities, family housing, and real estate, \$2,274,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$516,000.

Fort Meade, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, \$498,000.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Supply facilities, \$43,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and family housing, \$3,454,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$762,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and administrative facilities, \$847,000.

Fort McClellan, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, and hospital facilities, \$3,505,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,406,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$13,734,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,258,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$3,227,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Troop housing, and family housing, \$783,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,076,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,084,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Camp Desert Rock, Nevada: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$374,000.

Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,085,000.

Fort Ord, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,733,000.

Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Operational and training facilities \$173,000.

(Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Troop housing, medical facilities, and community facilities, \$5,844,000.

(Armed Forces Special Weapons)

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$273,000.

(Tactical Installations Support Facilities)

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, \$6,311,000.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(Alaskan Area)

Fairbanks Permafrost Research Area: Real estate, \$7,000.

(Pacific Command Area)

Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, \$240,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Troop housing, \$593,000.

Fort Shafter, Hawaii: Supply facilities, maintenance facilities, family housing, and community facilities, \$2,925,000.

Korea: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$904,000.

(United States Army, Europe)

France: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,063,000.

SEC. 102. Subject to the provisions of Section 402 hereof, the Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities, including those for defense missiles, by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$173,678,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$17,500,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, and subject to the provisions of section 513 of this Act, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 298 units.

Vicenza, Italy, 371 units.

Army Security Agency, location 13, 91 units.

Gateway Communications Station, 174 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, 316 units.
Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York, 120 units.
White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, 200 units;
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, 130 units.
Fort Lee, Virginia, 435 units.
Natick R&E, Massachusetts, 35 units.
Fort Belvoir, Virginia, 618 units.
Two Rock Ranch Station, California, 25 units.
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 50 units.
Reaumont Army Hospital, Texas, 125 units.
Fort Totten, New York, 130 units.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, 837 units.
Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois, 65 units.
Fort Rucker, Alabama, 400 units.
Fort Stewart, Georgia, 73 units.
Fort Bliss, Texas, 410 units.
Fort Hood, Texas, 500 units.
Fort Sill, Oklahoma, 349 units.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 700 units.
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, 200 units.
Fort Sheridan, Illinois, 50 units.
Forts Baker and Barry, California, 98 units.
Oakland Army Terminal, California, 88 units.
Fort Lewis, Washington, 856 units.
Branch United States Disciplinary Barracks, California, 160 units.
United States Military Academy, New York, 156 units.
Bossier Base, Louisiana, 200 units.
Medina Base, Texas, 125 units.
Sandia Base, New Mexico, 213 units.
Army Air Defense Command Stations, 466 units.

OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES

Canal Zone, 330 units.
Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, 385 units.
Fort Shafter, Hawaii, 481 units: Provided, however, That no family housing units shall be constructed on Fort DeRussy.
 (c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Aberdeen, Maryland, 796 units.
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 400 units.
Fort Sam Houston, Texas, 840 units.
Fort Sill, Oklahoma, 500 units.
 SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICE FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Pueblo Ordnance Depot, Colorado, strike out "\$563,000" and insert in place thereof "\$600,000".

(b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$44,407,000"

and "\$134,075,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$44,444,000" and "\$134,112,000", respectively.

SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, strike out "\$2,865,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,180,000".

(2) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, strike out "\$615,000" and insert in place thereof "\$731,000"; and with respect to Vint Hill Farms Station, Virginia, strike out "\$695,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,022,000".

(3) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Corps of Engineers)", with respect to Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois, strike out "\$1,822,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,815,000".

(4) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Medical Corps)", with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, strike out "\$4,472,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,714,000".

(5) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Second Army Area)", with respect to Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, strike out "\$923,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,264,000".

(6) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fourth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas, strike out "\$4,645,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,965,000"; and with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike out "\$3,053,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,454,000".

(7) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Sixth Army Area)", with respect to Ford Ord, California, strike out "\$1,407,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,742,000".

(8) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Military Academy)", with respect to the United States Military Academy, New York, strike out "\$756,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,171,000".

(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$237,320,000" and "\$546,387,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$244,125,000" and "\$553,192,000", respectively.

SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico, strike out "\$693,000" and insert in place thereof "\$735,000".

(2) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Chemical Corps)", with respect to Camp Detrick, Maryland, strike out "\$913,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,074,000"; and with respect to Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, strike out "\$867,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,044,000".

(3) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, strike out "\$6,856,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,576,000".

(4) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Corps of Engineers)", with respect to Fort Belvoir, Virginia, strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000".

(5) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Transportation Corps)", with respect to Fort Eustis, Virginia, strike out "\$1,231,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,436,000".

(6) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (First Army Area)", with respect to Fort Dix, New Jersey, strike out "\$54,000" and insert in place thereof "\$68,000".

(7) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Second Army Area)", with respect to Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, strike out "\$5,885,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,695,000".

(8) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Third Army Area)", with respect to Fort Benning, Georgia, strike out "\$422,000" and insert in place thereof "\$616,000"; and with respect to Fort McClellan, Alabama, strike out "\$397,000" and insert in place thereof "\$527,000".

(9) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fourth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Hood, Texas, strike out "\$2,457,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,846,000".

(10) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Riley, Kansas, strike out "\$1,519,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,892,000".

(11) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Sixth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Lewis, Washington, strike out "\$3,022,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,596,000"; and with respect to Fort Ord, California, strike out "\$223,000" and insert in place thereof "\$319,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

Under the subheading "(Alaskan Area)", with respect to Wildwood Station (Kenai), strike out "\$352,000" and insert in place thereof "\$516,000".

(c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 402 the amounts "\$95,010,000", "\$35,763,000", and "\$334,104,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$100,343,000", "\$35,927,000", and "\$339,601,000", respectively.

SEC. 108. (a) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Corps of Engineers)" with respect to Cold Regions Laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire, strike out "\$2,496,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,787,000".

(b) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$115,624,000" and "\$293,103,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$116,915,000" and "\$294,394,000".

SEC. 109. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed, unless the Secretary of Defense finds after due investigation that such action would be inimical to the national security, to make available to the Administrator of the General Services Administration, or his designee, the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Texas. Upon such property being made available, the Administrator or his designee is authorized and directed to enter into a contract or contracts for the sale of such property in lots or in its entirety under public bid procedures and at not less than the fair market value and to convey by quitclaim deed, all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this Act, in and to

such property to any legal person or group except Government agencies or departments upon such terms and conditions as the Administrator or his designee determines to be in the public interest.

(b) Any conveyance made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) hereof shall include the following conditions:

(1) All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands to be conveyed shall be reserved to the United States;

(2) The San Jacinto property shall be offered for sale within twenty-four months from the date of enactment of this Act;

(3) Title in and to such property shall remain in the United States until full payment of the agreed purchase price is made.

(c) In the event the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot is made available to the General Services Administration pursuant to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) hereof, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Army such sums as are necessary not to exceed \$40,000,000 to establish and construct, including land acquisition, replacement facilities to the extent required at Point-Aux-Pins, Alabama, or any other location selected by the Secretary of Defense.

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to modify the requirements of section 2662 of title 10 of the United States Code relative to coming into agreement with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to real estate actions.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Facility, Cape May, New Jersey: Operational and training facilities, \$141,000.

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Drydock, design, plans and engineering studies preliminary to initiation of construction, \$500,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Operational and training facilities, \$6,000,000: Provided, however, That no more than \$500,000 of this sum shall be utilized for protective works until the Secretary of the Navy determines in his judgment that sufficient action has been taken or arrangements made to arrest further subsidence of the shipyard.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Operational and training facilities, \$2,247,000.

Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California: Operational and training facilities, \$766,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,709,000.

Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$2,546,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

(Naval Air Training Stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Troop housing, \$1,041,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$14,940,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$4,679,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational and training facilities, \$114,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Maintenance facilities, \$1,252,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, California: Operational and training facilities, \$47,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Operational and training facilities, \$80,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Fentress, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, administrative facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$11,215,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational and training facilities, \$74,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$15,823,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$9,892,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, \$7,000,000.

Naval Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities and real estate, \$4,352,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational and training facilities and real estate, \$8,946,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,067,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, \$1,003,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Operational and training facilities, \$2,158,000.

(Special Purpose Air Stations)

Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, utilities, and operational and training facilities at the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland, \$17,666,000.

Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing (including operational and training facilities and troop housing on San Nicolas Island; and maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements at Camp Cooke), \$13,841,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Depot, Newport, Rhode Island: Utilities, \$2,210,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Administrative facilities, \$128,000.

Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California: Administrative facilities, \$146,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Operational and training facilities, \$280,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Utilities, \$462,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,138,000.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$168,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California: Utilities, \$206,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Maintenance facilities, \$241,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California: Supply facilities, \$129,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord, California: Maintenance facilities, \$2,517,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, California: Research, development, and test facilities, \$510,000.

Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Virginia: Research, development, and test facilities, \$44,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Hingham, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, \$694,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, \$601,000.

SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Troop housing, \$14,200,000.
Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$1,184,000.

Naval Receiving Station, District of Columbia: Operational facilities, \$650,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Operational and training facilities, \$1,368,000.

Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational and training facilities, \$273,000.

Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$4,643,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Operational and training facilities, \$4,199,000.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland: Hospital and medical facilities, \$8,503,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational and training facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$38,654,000.

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development, and test facilities, \$192,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, \$159,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

Naval Air Station, Agana, Mariana Islands: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$4,414,000.

Naval Station, Bermuda, British West Indies: Operational and training facilities, \$683,000.

Naval Air Station, Ford Island, Territory of Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, \$1,271,000.

Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Supply facilities, \$165,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, \$3,824,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Depot, Guam, Mariana Islands: Supply facilities, \$3,060,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Communication Unit Number Three, Asmara, Eritrea: Operational and training facilities, \$1,180,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Operational and training facilities, \$219,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Port Lyautey, Morocco: Operational and training facilities, \$519,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$890,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$75,301,000.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop naval installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$17,500,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, and subject to the provisions of section 513 of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Naval Magazine, Cartagena, Spain, 46 units, and community facilities.

Naval Magazine, El Ferrol, Spain, 45 units, and community facilities.

Naval Air Station, Port Lyautey, Morocco, 330 units.

Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Italy, 122 units, and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, 277 units.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, 800 units.

Naval Facility, Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, 27 units.

Naval Facility, Centerville, California, 24 units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, 849 units.

Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oregon, 24 units.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, 425 units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 800 units.

Naval Facility, Nantucket, Massachusetts, 19 units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500 units.

Naval Facility, Pacific Beach, Washington, 30 units.

Naval Facility, Point Sur, California, 24 units.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, 550 units.

Naval Ordnance Missile Test Facility, White Sands Proving Grounds, New Mexico, 51 units.

Naval Base, San Diego, California, 1,000 units, to be constructed on land, including the following tracts which are hereby authorized and directed to be transferred to the Department of the Navy by the Administrator of General Services without reimbursement: GSA H-Cal 546B; and GSA H-Cal 587.

OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES

Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 1,140 units.

Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, Headquarters, Camp H. M. Smith, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 168 units.

Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands, 220 units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 650 units.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 80 units.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 650 units.

(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, 1,562 units.

Marine Corps Training Center, Twenty-nine Palms, California, 493 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, 96 units.

Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Maryland, 385 units.

Naval Station, Green Cove Springs, Florida, 392 units.

Squantum Gardens, Massachusetts, 150 units.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "MEDICAL FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Virginia Area, strike out "\$12,815,000" and insert in place thereof "\$13,979,000".

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$139,143,000" and "\$266,927,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$140,307,000", and "\$268,091,000".

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "\$70,656,000", and inserting in place thereof "\$72,785,000".

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$70,656,000",

and "\$210,704,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$72,-785,000", and "\$212,833,000".

SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "MARINE CORPS FACILITIES", with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, strike out "\$648,000" and insert in place thereof "\$778,000".

(2) Under the subheading "ORDNANCE FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Underwater Ordnance Station, Newport, Rhode Island, strike out "\$370,000" and insert in place thereof "\$411,000".

(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

Under subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands, by striking out "\$6,525,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$9,063,000" and with respect to the Naval Station, Argentia, Newfoundland, by striking out "\$8,589,800" and inserting in place thereof "\$9,089,800".

(c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$308,463,600", "\$108,365,300", and "\$575,592,300" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$308,634,600", "\$111,403,300", and "\$578,801,300".

SEC. 208. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island, strike out "\$11,672,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,601,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Naval Air Training Stations)", with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas, strike out "\$2,247,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,569,000"; and with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, strike out "\$8,231,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,141,000".

(3) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)", with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, strike out "\$170,000" and insert in place thereof "\$273,000".

(4) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES", with respect to the Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia, strike out "\$237,000" and insert in place thereof "\$300,000", and with respect to the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, strike out "\$8,413,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,613,000".

(5) Under the subheading "MEDICAL FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Illinois, strike out "\$12,730,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,754,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 203 "\$85,939,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$86,711,000".

(c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$303,453,000", "\$85,939,000", and "\$451,393,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$312,004,000", "\$86,711,000", and "\$460,716,000".

SEC. 209. Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, insert before "\$7,669,000" the words "and land acquisition,".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$2,649,000.

Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Troop housing, \$990,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$10,659,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,176,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$10,673,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Community facilities, and utilities, \$229,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, \$9,948,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$935,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,721,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and utilities, \$3,689,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Medical facilities, \$122,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and real estate, \$2,799,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,579,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Troop housing, and ground improvements, \$795,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$3,992,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$6,696,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$975,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$1,177,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,746,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Utilities, \$157,000.

Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania: Supply facilities, \$94,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, \$1,560,000.

Memphis General Depot, Memphis, Tennessee: Administrative facilities, \$1,464,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California: Supply facilities, \$658,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$6,169,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,362,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$5,196,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, \$11,037,000.

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, \$981,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply, facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$10,109,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$1,650,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$481,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, \$165,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,884,000.

SCHOOL OF AVIATION MEDICINE

School of Aviation Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, \$12,000,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$979,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$1,584,000.

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Troop housing, \$640,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Troop housing, \$400,000.

Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$208,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Troop housing, \$750,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$441,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,213,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, \$2,119,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,432,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Maintenance facilities, \$358,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance facilities, \$319,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$245,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$571,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance of facilities, \$1,770,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$3,081,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,361,000.

CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Troop housing, \$1,805,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$11,589,000.

Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia, Utilities, \$172,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$18,937,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, \$78,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$2,874,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,901,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Troop housing, \$423,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,051,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,280,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,868,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,080,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,654,000.

Brunswick Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$11,417,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,996,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$2,257,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$4,183,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,734,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,939,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,174,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,404,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,346,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,931,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$4,094,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,703,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,489,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,493,000.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$3,401,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,795,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$897,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,250,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,463,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$11,716,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$3,774,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,577,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,832,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$3,344,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,137,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$1,039,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$3,265,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$940,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$208,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$15,552,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,352,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,997,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$8,431,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Troop housing, \$945,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,185,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Maintenance facilities, \$536,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,371,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,650,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Troop housing, \$591,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,707,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,339,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,474,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$563,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$169,833,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Various locations: Supply facilities and utilities, \$696,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, \$380,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, \$710,000.

King Salmon Airport: Operational and training facilities, \$340,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$24,986,000.

CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and training facilities, \$1,540,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$5,347,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$144,000.

Midway Island: Supply facilities, \$839,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$15,688,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Base, Guam: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,508,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$643,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$21,431,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$19,952,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$29,135,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$315,000.

SEC. 302. Subject to the provisions of Section 402 hereof, the Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or tem-

porary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$269,100,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$17,500,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, and subject to the provisions of section 513 of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Lajes Field, Azores, 306 units.

Kindley Air Force Base, Bermuda, 300 units.

Laon, France, 102 units.

Keflavik Airport, Iceland, 300 units.

Benguerir Airport, Morocco, 248 units.

Sidi Slimane Air Base, Morocco, 295 units.

Clark Air Force Base, Philippines, 900 units.

Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, 200 units.

Madrid-Torrejon area, Spain, 460 units.

Moron-San Pablo area, Spain, 40 units.

Various locations, Spain, 120 units, and community facilities.

Zaragoza Air Base, Spain, 176 units.

Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 50 units.

Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 190 units.

Bruntingthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 93 units.

Brize Norton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 215 units.

Chelveston RAF Station, United Kingdom, 79 units.

Chicksands Priory RAF Station, United Kingdom, 83 units.

Fairford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 177 units.

High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 110 units.

Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 55 units, and community facilities.

Stansted-Mountfitchet RAF Station, United Kingdom, 22 units.

Upper Heyford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 259 units.

Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, 416 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force

is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Camp Adair Air Force Station, Oregon, 150 units.
Amarillo Air Force Base, Texas, 500 units.
Beale Air Force Base, California, 970 units.
Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 250 units.
Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, 450 units.
Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 536 units.
Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 50 units.
Custer Air Force Station, Michigan, 169 units.
Donaldson Air Force Base, South Carolina, 275 units.
Cooke Air Force Base, California, 525 units.
Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 500 units.
Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 530 units.
Duluth Municipal Airport, Minnesota, 365 units.
Edwards Air Force Base, California, 778 units.
Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 220 units.
Forbes Air Force Base, Kansas, 414 units.
Fort Lee Air Force Station, Virginia, 154 units.
Geiger Field, Washington, 168 units.
Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 460 units.
Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 744 units.
Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, 270 units.
Hamilton Air Force Base, California, 550 units.
Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, 400 units.
James Connally Air Force Base, Texas, 366 units.
Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 290 units.
Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 475 units.
K. I. Sawyer Airport, Michigan, 595 units.
Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, 490 units.
Lakes Charles Air Force Base, Louisiana, 300 units.
Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, 500 units.
Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 200 units.
Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio, 400 units.
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 150 units.
Mather Air Force Base, California, 220 units.
McChord Air Force Base, Washington, 1,000 units.
McClellan Air Force Base, California, 540 units.
McCoy Air Force Base, Florida, 668 units.
McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, 1,450 units.
Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 932 units.
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 270 units.
Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, 200 units.
Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, New York, 290 units.
Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 616 units.
Ordnard Air Force Base, California, 315 units.
Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, 483 units.
Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.
Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wisconsin, 900 units.
Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Missouri, 610 units.
Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, 150 units.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Michigan, 580 units.
Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas, 500 units.
Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa, 235 units.
Stewart Air Force Base, New York, 300 units.
Suffolk County Air Force Base, New York, 220 units.
Syracuse Air Force Station, New York, 216 units.
Topsham Air Force Station, Maine, 177 units.
Truax Field, Wisconsin, 280 units.
Turner Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units.
United States Air Force Academy, Colorado, 300 units.
Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 230 units.
Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts, 310 units.
Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 154 units.
Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, 150 units.
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 618 units.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, 1,050 units.
Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, 600 units.

(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:

Brookley Air Force Base, Alabama, 175 units.
Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, 600 units.
Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 225 units.
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, 550 units.
Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, 500 units.
Hunter Air Force Base, Georgia, 500 units.
Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, 592 units.
Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, 480 units.
March Air Force Base, California, 644 units.
Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, 250 units.
Mitchel Air Force Base, New York, 628 units.
Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, 612 units.
Reese Air Force Base, Texas, 418 units.
Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, 400 units.
Walker Air Force Base, New Mexico, 800 units.
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, 2,000 units.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301 as follows:

Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND", with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts, strike out "\$6,076,000", and insert in place thereof "\$6,522,000".

Under the subheading "AIR MATERIAL COMMAND", with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out "\$14,508,000" and insert in place thereof "\$15,800,000".

(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "\$824,300,000" and "\$1,363,189,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$826,038,000" and "\$1,364,927,000", respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota, strike out "\$1,469,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,636,000".

(2) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts, strike out "\$11,577,000" and insert in place thereof "\$13,341,000".

Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND", with respect to Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, strike out "\$1,339,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,661,000".

Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND", with respect to James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas, strike out "\$4,687,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,301,000".

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out "\$1,586,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,726,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the amounts "\$811,342,000" and "\$1,447,950,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$814,349,000" and "\$1,450,957,000", respectively.

SEC. 307. (a) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana, strike out "\$2,048,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,390,000".

(2) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri, strike out "\$1,100,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,348,000".

(3) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out "\$6,804,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,507,000".

(4) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts, strike out "\$559,000" and insert in place thereof "\$615,000".

Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND", with respect to Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, strike out "\$899,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,128,000".

Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND", with respect to Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas, strike out "\$460,000" and insert in place thereof "\$637,000".

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana, strike out "\$3,344,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,633,000".

(2) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California, strike out "\$7,458,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,087,000".

(3) with respect to MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida, strike out "\$936,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,268,000".

(4) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out "\$2,344,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,947,000".

(5) with respect to Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri, strike out "\$235,000" and insert in place thereof "\$306,000".

(b) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "\$394,076,000" and

"\$601,781,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$399,755,000" and "\$607,460,000", respectively.

SEC. 308. (a) Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended, under the heading "ALERT AND DISPERSAL OF STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND FORCES" in section 1, as follows:

(1) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out "\$895,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,892,000".

(2) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out "\$867,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,479,000".

(3) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out "\$4,380,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,479,000".

(4) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "\$690,000" and insert in place thereof "\$969,000".

(b) Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended by striking out in section 3 the amount "\$549,670,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$552,657,000".

SEC. 309. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure "\$135,425,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure "\$139,797,000".

SEC. 310. The last paragraph under the heading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND" in title III of Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress (69 Stat. 342), is amended to read as follows:

"Various Locations: Research, development, and operational facilities (including not more than \$357,000 for an off-base roadway approximately ten miles in length in the vicinity of the north boundary of Cape Canaveral—an auxiliary to Patrick Air Force Base) \$20,000,000."

The amendment made by this section is effective from March 1, 1956.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities required for advanced research projects and in connection therewith may acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000.

SEC. 402. The Secretary of Defense or his designee shall, prior to the utilization of the funds authorized by Sections 102 and 302 of this Act for establishing or developing classified military installations and facilities for defense missiles by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force, respectively, determine with respect to each defended area, which missile or combination of missiles will be employed in that area. In making such determination, the Secretary of Defense shall have the authority to transfer such funds as may be made available pursuant to the authorizations contained in such sections for such installations and facilities, to the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, to enable such Secretaries to utilize the authority contained in such sections in accordance with such determinations.

SEC. 403. The Secretary of Defense shall report in detail semiannually to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to the exercise of the authority granted by this title.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. *The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 529, 40 U. S. C. 259, 267), and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.*

SEC. 502. *There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations, for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—*

(1) *for title I: Inside the United States, \$109,556,000; outside the United States, \$8,732,000; section 102, \$173,678,000; section 103, \$17,500,000; or a total of \$309,466,000.*

(2) *for title II: Inside the United States, \$216,809,000; outside the United States, \$16,384,000; section 202, \$75,301,000; section 203, \$17,500,000; or a total of \$325,994,000.*

(3) *for title III: Inside the United States, \$542,161,000; outside the United States, \$123,654,000; section 302, \$269,100,000; section 303, \$17,500,000; or a total of \$952,415,000.*

(4) *for title IV: \$50,000,000.*

SEC. 503. *Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.*

SEC. 504. *Any outstanding authority heretofore provided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991), for the provision of family housing shall be available for the construction of family housing at any installations for which appropriated fund family housing is authorized to be constructed under titles I and III of this Act.*

SEC. 505. *Whenever—*

(1) *the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and*

(2) *the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts; the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.*

SEC. 506. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States, its territories and possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another Department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and section 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547, 551). The Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 507. As of July 1, 1959, all authorization for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 4, 1956, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1959, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) the authorizations for public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in sections 2231-2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886);

(5) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$30,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(6) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

(7) the authorization for public works and for the appropriation of funds that are contained in the Act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended; and

(8) notwithstanding the provision of section 506 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 558), the authorization for:

(a) jet engine test cells in the amount of \$1,850,000 at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia, that is contained in title II, section 201 under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" of the Act of August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 440, 442), as amended;

(b) ammunition storage facilities in the amount of \$225,000 at the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California; navigational aids in the amount of \$590,000 at the Marine

Corps Air Station, El Toro, California; research and development facilities in the amount of \$1,804,000 at the Naval Air Turbine Test Station, Trenton, New Jersey; and navigational aids in the amount of \$400,000 at the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: that are contained in title II, section 201, under the heading, "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 540), as amended;

(c) the development of aviation ordnance facilities in the amount of \$2,638,000 that is contained in title II, section 202, of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 543), as amended.

SEC. 508. Section 408 (b) of the Act of June 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 236, 245), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 509. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1958 through and including 1961, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than five thousand of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 510. Section 406 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1015), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of a military department may acquire any interest in land that—

"(1) he or his designee determines is needed in the interest of national defense; and

"(2) does not cost more than \$25,000 (exclusive of administrative costs and the amounts of any deficiency judgments).

This section does not authorize the acquisition, as part of the same project, of two or more contiguous parcels of land that together cost more than \$25,000."

SEC. 511. Section 408 (a) of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(5) No determination that a project is urgently required shall be necessary for projects, the cost of which is not in excess of \$5,000."

SEC. 512. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization Act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) housing units leased, utilizing available operation and maintenance appropriations, for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions of section 417 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1018).

SEC. 513. (a) Notwithstanding the authorizations for the construction of family housing contained in subsections 104 (a), 204 (a) and 304 (a) of this Act, the total number of units of family housing contracted for during fiscal year 1959 pursuant to the authority contained in such subsections shall not exceed a total of four thousand units. The Secretary of Defense shall determine the total number of units to be constructed by each of the military services in conformity with the provisions of this subsection.

(b) Notwithstanding the authorizations for the construction of family housing contained in subsection 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b) of this Act, the total number of units of family housing contracted for during fiscal year 1959 pursuant to the authority contained in such subsections shall not exceed a total of thirty thousand units. The Secretary of Defense shall determine the total number of units to be constructed by each of the military services in conformity with the provisions of this subsection. The Secretaries of the three military departments, or the designee of each, shall promptly notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives of any determination made hereunder as it affects each such department.

(c) To the extent that any of the authorizations contained in subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b) of this Act to construct housing at locations specified therein are not utilized, such authorizations may be exercised to construct housing at other locations, except that (1) the total number of housing units to be constructed under the authority of this subsection by any service shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total number of units authorized to be constructed by that service under subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), or 304 (b), as the case may be, and (2) the total number of units constructed by the three services pursuant to this authority shall not, when added to the total number of units constructed pursuant to the authority contained in subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b), exceed the total number of units authorized to be contracted for by subsection (b) hereof.

(d) Section 404 (c) of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

“(c) (1) Condemnation proceedings instituted pursuant to this section shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 357; 40 U. S. C. 257), as amended, or any other applicable Federal statute. Before any such condemnation proceedings are instituted, an effort shall be made to acquire the property involved by negotiation. In any such condemnation proceedings, and in the interests of expedition, the issue of just compensation may be determined by a commission of three qualified, disinterested persons to be appointed by the court. Any commission appointed hereunder shall have the powers of a master provided in subdivision (c) of rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and proceedings before it shall be governed by the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (d) of such rule. Its action and report shall be determined by a majority and its findings and report shall have the effect, and be dealt with by the court in accordance with the practice prescribed in paragraph (2) of subdivision (e) of such rule. Trial of all issues, other than just compensation, shall be by the court.

“(2) In any condemnation proceedings instituted pursuant to this section, the court shall not order the party in possession to surrender possession in advance of final judgment unless a declaration of taking has

been filed, and a deposit of the amount estimated to be just compensation has been made, under the first section of the Act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421), providing for such declarations. Unless title is in dispute, the court, upon application, shall promptly pay to the owner at least 75 per centum of the amount so deposited, but such payment shall be made without prejudice to any party to the proceeding. In the event that condemnation proceedings are instituted in accordance with procedures under such Act of February 26, 1931, the court shall order that the amount deposited shall be paid in a lump sum or over a period not exceeding five years in accordance with stipulations executed by the parties in the proceedings. In connection with condemnation proceedings which do not utilize the procedures under such Act, the Secretary or his designee, after final judgment of the court, may pay or agree to pay in a lump sum or, in accordance with stipulations executed by the parties to the proceedings, over a period not exceeding five years the difference between the outstanding principal obligation, plus accrued interest, and the price for the property fixed by the court. Unless such payment is made in a lump sum, the unpaid balance thereof shall bear interest at the rate of 4 per centum per annum."

SEC. 514. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States at a unit cost in excess of—

- (1) \$32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;
- (2) \$6 per square foot for regular warehousing;
- (3) \$1,850 per man for permanent barracks;
- (4) \$8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 515. Titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1958".

SEC. 516. Section 407 (e) of Public Law 85-241, approved August 30, 1957, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1960" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1961".

TITLE VI

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 601. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) That part of section 2233 (a) that precedes clause (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2233. Acquisition

"(a) Subject to sections 2233a, 2234, 2235, 2236, and 2238 of this title and subsection (c) of this section, the Secretary of Defense may,—"

(2) Section 2233 is amended by adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

"(e) The Secretary of Defense may procure advance planning, construction design, and architectural services in connection with facilities to be established or developed under this chapter which are not otherwise authorized by law.

"(f) Facilities authorized by subsection (a) shall not be considered 'military public works' under the provisions of the military construction authorization acts that repeal prior authorizations for military public works."

(3) The following new section is inserted after section 2233:

“§ 2233a. *Limitation*

“No expenditure or contribution that is more than \$50,000 may be made under section 2233 of this title for any facility that has not been authorized by a law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces. This requirement does not apply to the following:

“(a) Facilities acquired by lease.

“(b) Facilities acquired, constructed, expanded, rehabilitated, converted, or equipped to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed, where the Senate and the House of Representatives have been notified of that action.”

(4) The analysis of chapter 133 is amended by inserting the following new item:

“2233a. *Limitation.*”

SEC. 602. (a) Section 3 of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended by paragraph (a) of the Act of August 9, 1955, chapter 662 (69 Stat. 593), and by section 2 of the Act of August 29, 1957, Public Law 85-215 (71 Stat. 489), is amended by striking out the words “in an amount not to exceed \$580,000,000 over a period of the next eight fiscal years commencing with fiscal year 1951,”.

(b) Section 3 (a) of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended by section 414 of the Act of August 3, 1956, chapter 939 (70 Stat. 1018), is amended by striking out the words “and without regard to the monetary limitation otherwise imposed by this section”.

SEC. 603. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

(1) For Department of the Navy:

NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Georgia: Training facilities, \$480,000.

Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Supply facilities and utilities, \$259,000.

Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$652,000.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Navigational aids and utilities, \$179,000.

Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Airfield lighting, \$147,000.

Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Operational and training facilities, liquid fueling and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting, and land acquisition, \$1,992,000.

Naval Air Station, New Orleans (Alvin Callender Field), Louisiana: Administrative facilities, community facilities, navigational aids, operational facilities, supply facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,447,000.

Naval Air Station, New York, New York: Airfield lighting, \$130,000.

Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$652,000.

Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, \$570,000.

Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Utilities, \$407,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Utilities, \$99,000.

NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

Alameda, California: Waterfront operational facilities, \$128,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Bloomington, Indiana: Training facilities, \$95,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Boston, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$108,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Centralia, Washington: Training facilities, \$81,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Chillicothe, Ohio: Training facilities, \$100,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Danville, Kentucky: Training facilities, \$84,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Dunkirk, New York: Training facilities, \$79,000.

Fort Schuyler, New York: Waterfront operational facilities, \$120,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Hayward, California: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$99,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Honolulu, Hawaii: Training facilities, \$515,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics-Facility, Iowa City, Iowa: Training facilities, \$97,000.

Master Control Radio Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Communications, \$210,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Olympia (Tumwater), Washington: Training facilities, \$47,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Pasadena, California: Training facilities, \$132,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Port Chicago, California: Training facilities, \$94,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Jose, California: Land acquisition, \$78,000.

Saint Petersburg, Florida: Waterfront operational facilities, \$26,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Steubenville, Ohio: Land acquisition, \$18,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, White Oak (Lewiston), Maryland: Training facilities, \$557,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Yakima, Washington: Training facilities, \$48,000.

MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Lynchburg, Virginia: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$388,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Memphis, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$453,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Moline, Illinois: Training facilities, \$152,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Pasadena, California: Training facilities, \$163,000.

(2) For Department of the Air Force:

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, \$129,000.

Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$3,174,000.

Bates Field, Mobile, Alabama: Maintenance facility, \$97,000.

Bradley Field, Windsor Locks, Connecticut: Maintenance facility and utilities and ground improvements, \$160,000.

Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Maintenance facility, and supply facility, \$325,000.

General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Maintenance facility, and operational and training facilities, \$173,000.

Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, New Hampshire: Operational and training facilities, \$180,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Belton, Missouri: Operational and training facilities, \$101,000.

Naval Air Station (Alvin Callender Field), Orleans Parish, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities, \$622,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facility, \$93,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, and hospital and medical facilities, \$171,000.

Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, \$740,000.

Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel, Minnesota: Site improvements, \$500,000.

Birmingham Municipal Airport, Birmingham, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, \$150,000.

Byrd Field, Richmond, Virginia: Supply facilities, \$50,000.

Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, \$579,000.

Capital Airport, Springfield, Illinois: Supply facilities, \$78,000.

Des Moines Municipal Airport, Des Moines, Iowa: Operational and training facilities, \$53,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements. \$1,308,000.

Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, New Hampshire: Operational and training facilities, \$170,000.

Gulfport Municipal Airport, Gulfport, Mississippi: Supply facilities, \$362,000.

Hayward Municipal Airport, Hayward, California: Operational and training facilities, \$113,000.

Hensley Field, Grand Prairie, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,862,000.

Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$159,000.

Kellogg Field, Battle Creek, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,136,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$570,000.

Martinsburg Municipal Airport, Martinsburg, West Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$123,000.

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Operational and training facilities, \$1,099,000.

Ontario International Airport, Ontario, California: Operational and training facilities, \$127,000.

Portland Municipal Airport, Portland, Oregon: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, \$233,000.

Rosecrans Field, Saint Joseph, Missouri: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$123,000.

San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Supply facilities, \$70,000.

Sky Harbor Airport, Phoenix, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, \$655,000.

Standiford Field, Louisville, Kentucky: Operational and training facilities, and administrative facilities, \$715,000.

Theodore F. Green Airport, Providence, Rhode Island: Operational and training facilities, \$213,000.

Travis Field, Savannah, Georgia: Housing, supply facilities and utilities, \$317,000.

Various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, \$300,000.

(3) *For Department of the Army:*

ARMY RESERVE

Batavia, New York: Training facilities, \$171,000.

Beckley, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$289,000.

Beloit, Wisconsin: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Canandaigua, New York: Training facilities, \$171,000.

Canton, Ohio: Training facilities, \$40,000.

Cheyenne, Wyoming: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Durant, Oklahoma: Training facilities, \$141,000.

Fargo, North Dakota: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Fremont, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Galesburg, Illinois: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Greenwood, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$85,000.

Hempstead, New York (Nr2): Training facilities, \$536,000.

Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$99,000.

Kewaunee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Madison, Wisconsin (Nr2): Training facilities, \$490,000.

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma (Nr2): Training facilities, \$443,000.

Saint Marys, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Saint Marys, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Salinas, California: Training facilities, \$164,000.

Sinton, Texas: Training facilities, \$134,000.

Stockton, California: Training facilities, \$164,000.

Warren, Ohio: Training facilities, \$289,000.

Weirton, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$149,000.

San Jose, California: Road improvements, \$32,000.

Land acquisition: Training facilities, \$419,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

(ARMORY)

Ackerman, Mississippi: Training facilities, \$54,000.
Agawam, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$210,000.
Amarillo, Texas: Training facilities, \$231,000.
Asheville, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$132,000.
Ashford, Alabama: Training facilities, \$70,000.
Atlanta, Georgia: Training facilities, \$132,000.
Batesburg, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
Batesville, Mississippi: Training facilities, \$54,000.
Beckley, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$200,000.
Belfast, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.
Belmont, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.
Belton, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$122,000.
Belton, Texas: Training facilities, \$86,000.
Berryville, Arkansas: Training facilities, \$45,000.
Berryville, Virginia: Training facilities, \$135,000.
Bethel, Alaska: Training facilities, \$480,000.
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$45,000.
Boston, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$270,000.
Bridgeport, Alabama: Training facilities, \$70,000.
Brunswick, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.
Caldwell, Ohio: Training facilities, \$135,000.
Calhoun, Georgia: Training facilities, \$110,000.
Camden, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$45,000.
Catskill, New York: Training facilities, \$300,000.
Chesterfield, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$206,000.
Cincinnati, Ohio: Training facilities, \$300,000.
Clarksburg, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$189,000.
Clayton, New Mexico: Training facilities, \$57,000.
Clover, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
Cody, Wyoming: Training facilities, \$142,000.
Concord, New Hampshire: Training facilities, \$375,000.
Crossville, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
Cuero, Texas: Training facilities, \$93,000.
Culver City, California: Training facilities, \$38,000.
Dallas Number 5, Texas: Training facilities, \$154,000.
Dayton, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
Duluth, Minnesota: Training facilities, \$37,000.
Eatonton, Georgia: Training facilities, \$90,000.
Edna, Texas: Training facilities, \$93,000.
El Campo, Texas: Training facilities, \$104,000.
Española, New Mexico: Training facilities, \$57,000.
Fairbanks, Alaska: Training facilities, \$277,000.
Farmville, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.
Fontana, California: Training facilities, \$105,000.
Franklin, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
Fredericktown, Missouri: Training facilities, \$135,000.
Gainesville, Florida: Training facilities, \$120,000.
Gainesville, Texas: Training facilities, \$111,000.

Gardiner, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.
Gassaway, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$189,000.
Greensboro, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$357,000.
Greenville, Ohio: Training facilities, \$165,000.
Hammonton, New Jersey: Training facilities, \$175,000.
Harriman, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
Hendersonville, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$120,000.
Hollister, California: Training facilities, \$105,000.
Honey Grove, Texas: Training facilities, \$90,000.
Houston Number 1, Texas: Training facilities, \$323,000.
Houston Number 2, Texas: Training facilities, \$264,000.
Jerome, Idaho: Training facilities, \$52,000.
Johnston, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
Juncos, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, \$38,000.
Juneau, Alaska: Training facilities, \$450,000.
Kannapolis, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$109,000.
Kealakekua, Hawaii: Training facilities, \$145,000.
Ketchikan, Alaska: Training facilities, \$277,000.
Keyser, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$157,000.
Kingsport, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$165,000.
Lake City, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
Lasker-Woodland, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$103,000.
Laurinburg, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$105,000.
Lincolnton, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$95,000.
Ligonier, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$45,000.
Little Rock, Arkansas: Training facilities, \$260,000.
Livingston, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
Logan, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$189,000.
Lovell, Wyoming: Training facilities, \$142,000.
Marietta, Georgia: Training facilities, \$90,000.
Mayaguez, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, \$160,000.
Middleboro, Kentucky: Training facilities, \$130,000.
Millinocket, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.
Minneapolis, Minnesota: Training facilities, \$88,000.
Nashville, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.
New Bern, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
New London, Connecticut: Training facilities, \$360,000.
Norfolk, Virginia: Training facilities, \$441,000.
Northwest St. Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, \$130,000.
Oak Ridge, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$142,000.
Ocean Springs, Mississippi: Training facilities, \$54,000.
Pacolet Mills, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
Patchogue, New York: Training facilities, \$375,000.
Persons, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
Phoenix, Arizona: Training facilities, \$65,000.
Pitman, New Jersey: Training facilities, \$175,000.
Portland, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.
Preston, Idaho: Training facilities, \$57,000.
Princeton, New Jersey: Training facilities, \$175,000.
Pulaski, Virginia: Training facilities, \$135,000.
Quitman, Georgia: Training facilities, \$90,000.
Reynolds, Georgia: Training facilities, \$90,000.
Richmond, Virginia: Training facilities, \$441,000.
Rigby, Idaho: Training facilities, \$57,000.

Rockingham, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.
 Roseboro, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.
 Saco, Maine: \$150,000.
 Salem, New Jersey: Training facilities, \$15,000.
 Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, \$161,000.
 Salem, South Dakota: Training facilities, \$150,000.
 San Fernando, California: Training facilities, \$115,000.
 San Rafael (Fairfax), California: Training facilities, \$115,000.
 Saranac Lake, New York: Training facilities, \$300,000.
 Saugus, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$210,000.
 Shallotte, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$95,000.
 Silver City, New Mexico: Training facilities, \$57,000.
 Sitka, Alaska: Training facilities, \$45,000.
 Smithfield, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.
 Smithtown, New York: Training facilities, \$300,000.
 Socorro, New Mexico: Training facilities, \$57,000.
 South Boston, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$360,000.
 South Pittsburg, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 South Portland, Maine: Training facilities, \$150,000.
 Saint George, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
 Stillwater, Minnesota: Training facilities, \$37,000.
 Storm Lake, Iowa: Training facilities, \$95,000.
 Sturgis, Michigan: Training facilities, \$220,000.
 Swanton, Vermont: Training facilities, \$137,000.
 Tell City, Indiana: Training facilities, \$188,000.
 Texarkana, Texas: Training facilities, \$153,000.
 Twin Falls, Idaho: Training facilities, \$90,000.
 Valparaiso, Indiana: Training facilities, \$188,000.
 Ventura, California: Training facilities, \$115,000.
 Wahoo, Nebraska: Training facilities, \$115,000.
 Wallace, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$95,000.
 Waverly, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 Waynesboro, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 Weston, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$189,000.
 Whitman, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$210,000.
 Whitmire, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
 Winnemucca, Nevada: Training facilities, \$110,000.
 Yates, Center, Kansas: Training facilities, \$93,000.
 Yuma, Arizona: Training facilities, \$45,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

(NONARMORY)

Anchorage, Alaska: Administrative and supply facilities, \$192,000.
 Augusta, Maine: Administrative and supply facilities, \$190,000.
 Burlington, Vermont: Administrative and supply facilities, \$208,000.
 Camp Beauregard, Louisiana: Administrative and supply facilities, \$325,000.
 Camp Beauregard, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities, \$279,000.
 Camp Butner, North Carolina: Supply facilities, \$353,000.
 Camp Dodge, Iowa: Maintenance facilities, \$80,000.
 Camp Dodge, Iowa: Supply facilities, \$120,000.
 Camp Shelby, Mississippi: Maintenance facilities, \$165,000.
 Columbia, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, \$80,000.

Concord, New Hampshire: Administrative and supply facilities, \$145,000.

Culbertson, Montana: Maintenance facilities, \$73,000.

Jefferson City, Missouri: Administrative and supply facilities, \$113,000.

Kalispell, Montana: Maintenance facilities, \$67,000.

Nashville, Tennessee: Administrative and supply facilities, \$493,000.

Salt Lake City, Utah: Maintenance facilities, \$235,000.

Trenton, New Jersey: Supply facilities, \$80,000.

(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection.

SEC. 604. The first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, does not apply to—

(a) facilities that—

(1) have been the subject of consultation with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives before July 1, 1958;

(2) are under contract before July 1, 1960; and

(3) are funded from appropriations made before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(b) facilities that are authorized by section 603 (4) of this Act; or

(c) The following facilities for the Air National Guard of the United States:

(1) Milford Point, Connecticut: Operation and training facilities, \$337,000.

(2) Wellesley, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, \$319,000.

(3) Westchester County Airport, White Plains, New York: Operational and training facilities, \$105,000.

SEC. 605. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and section 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 606. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 603 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$11,886,000.

(2) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air Force Reserve, \$5,054,000;

(b) Air National Guard of the United States, \$11,976,000.

(3) for Department of the Army: Army Reserve and Army National Guard of the United States, \$28,330,000.

SEC. 607. (a) Any of the amounts named in section 603 of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses 1, 2 (a), 2 (b), and 3 of section 606 respectively.

(b) The Secretary of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, establish or develop facilities for Reserve forces other than those facilities authorized by section 603 of this Act, except that (1) the total cost of such facilities by any service shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total amount authorized to be expended by that service for projects under such section, and (2) the total cost for all projects established or developed by any service under the authority of this subsection shall not, when added to the total cost of the projects established or developed by such service under the authority of section 603, exceed the amounts prescribed by clauses 1, 2 (a), 2 (b), 3, of section 606, respectively.

SEC. 608. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1958".

And the Senate agreed to the same.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,
L. C. ARENDS,
L. H. GAVIN,
BOB WILSON,
KATHERINE ST. GEORGE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN STENNIS,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

On July 10, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 13015, which was the fiscal year 1959 military construction and authorization for the three military departments and the Department of Defense. For the first time, the bill also contains authority for Reserve component construction.

The larger differences and the action agreed upon by the conferees are as follows:

TITLE I

ARMY

In the Army title of the bill, the following items were in disagreement: The deletion by the Senate of hospitals at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., and Fort McClellan, Ala.; the deletion of a real-estate acquisition at Baywood Park, Calif.; the elimination of authority for construction of troop housing at Camp Desert Rock, Nev., and the elimination of Capehart housing units at Fort Bragg, N. C., and Fort Eustis, Va.

More importantly, the House and Senate versions of the bill were in disagreement with respect to the removal from the Army title of approximately \$137 million representing construction for defense missiles and the placement of that authority in title IV of the bill under the Secretary of Defense.

Another area of disagreement involved the raising of the House figure of \$10 million to \$25 million for authority to construct facilities made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons development, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules.

Section 109 of the "Army" title relative to the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Houston, Tex., was a further item in disagreement.

Under the wording in the House version of the bill, it was mandatory that this depot be moved from its present location to the Point-Aux-Pins area, Alabama. The Senate varied the House version of this section in a number of respects. The most important change made by the Senate was to require that the depot be moved from Houston, Tex.—

unless the Secretary of Defense finds after due investigation that such action would be inimical to the national security.

The House and Senate conferees resolved these differences as follows:

The Senate receded with respect to the provision of hospitals at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., and Fort McClellan, Ala.

The House receded with respect to the acquisition of real estate at Baywood Park, Calif., and also with respect to the provision of troop housing at Camp Desert Rock, Nev. The House further receded with respect to the provision of Capehart housing at Fort Bragg, N. C., and Fort Eustis, Va.

The difference between the Senate and House versions of the bill with respect to defense missiles was resolved to the satisfaction of all

conferees by the deletion of section 402 of the bill as it appeared in the Senate version and inserting in lieu thereof a section 402, which renders entirely clear that the Secretary of Defense must make a decision with respect to the type of missile which is to be used and grants the Secretary of Defense authority to transfer funds between the Army and the Air Force in consonance with his decision.

With respect to San Jacinto, the House accepted the Senate version with an amendment. This amendment will require that should the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot be turned over to the General Services Administration for disposal, the requirement that the Department of the Army come into agreement with the Senate and House Armed Services Committees in accordance with existing law, will still obtain. The only other change made in this section was to require that if the Secretary of Defense determines that the depot should be moved, it be moved in 24 months rather than the 36 months set out in the Senate version of the bill.

In this connection, the conferees wish to draw attention to that portion of the Senate committee report relating to San Jacinto and other facilities of a similar nature. It is realized that ammunition storage and outloading facilities create hazards in the area surrounding them, and it is felt that all these installations should receive close study to ascertain whether they should remain in their present locations. The Senate conferees made particular note of the facility at Port Chicago being in this category and pointed out that the reason why the Senate committee has not taken action with respect to the movement of this installation is the fact that the Department of Defense indicates that its existence at its present location is essential to national security and that no satisfactory alternate site has been found on the Pacific coast.

As stated above, the House version of the bill contained an authority in the amount of \$10 million to be used to construct facilities made necessary by changes in Army missions, etc. The Senate version on the other hand contained authority in the amount of \$25 million for this purpose. The House and Senate conferees resolved this difference by setting a sum of \$17,500,000 as an amount adequate to cover the contingencies contemplated by this portion of the bill.

TITLE II

NAVY

The only major areas of disagreement in the Navy title of the bill were the granting of authority for the construction of a drydock at the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, S. C.; the addition by the Senate of a Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Ariz.; the deletion by the Senate of a classified facility in section 202; the raising from \$10 million to \$25 million authority relating to changes in Navy missions, etc., as is described above with respect to a similar authority for the Army; and authority to construct 1,000 units of Capehart housing at the Naval Base, San Diego, Calif., together with the transfer of certain land necessary for this housing.

These changes were resolved as follows:

The House receded with respect to the drydock at Charleston, S. C., with an amendment. The amendment contemplates that authority in the amount of \$500,000 will be provided for necessary

design, plans, and other necessary work preliminary to the initiation of construction of this important facility. It is the intention of the conferees that this authority be available for the removal and/or relocation of any structures in the area in which the construction is contemplated. The insertion by the Senate of the authority for the Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Ariz., was agreed to by the House conferees with an amendment providing for the acquisition of the necessary real estate. The Senate receded with respect to the authority which appeared in the House version of the bill for a classified facility in section 202. Another classified facility in an amount approximating \$1,200,000 was removed from this section at the insistence of the House conferees.

Again, the compromise figure of \$17,500,000 was accepted by the conferees for construction made necessary in Navy missions, new weapons development, etc., as was reached with respect to the Army, above.

The Senate receded with respect to the 1,000 units of Capehart housing at the Navy Base, San Diego, Calif., and a minor adjustment was made with respect to the land necessary for this housing. The Senate had added Wherry acquisitions at Camp Pendleton, Calif., Twentynine Palms, Calif., and at Squantum Gardens, Mass. The House receded with respect to these three additions.

TITLE III

AIR FORCE

There were few areas of disagreement in the "Air Force" title of the bill. These were the provision of facilities at Lowry Air Force Base, Colo., which the House allowed but the Senate deleted. The Senate had inserted authority for construction at Moody Air Force Base, Ga. The House version of the bill had no similar item. Also, the House had provided authority for troop housing construction at Barksdale Air Force Base, La., which item was deleted by the Senate. The Senate had also deleted commissaries at Castle Air Force Base, Calif., Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak., and Westover Air Force Base, Mass., and a railway facility at Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, N. C. The Senate also had inserted a classified facility under the Aircraft Control and Warning System portion of the bill.

A further difference involved the question of defense missiles as such is dealt with in section 302 of the bill. The only other difference between the House and Senate version in the "Air Force" title related to the question of the proper sum for authority for construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, etc. This matter is dealt with with respect to section 102 under the "Army" title of the bill. The same solution of the difference was arrived at by the provision of \$17,500,000, as in titles I and II.

The other differences between the House and Senate versions were resolved as follows:

The House receded with respect to Lowry Air Force Base primarily on the basis that the Air Force could no longer defend this item in any specific fashion since the location of the facility still awaits decisions within the Department of Defense.

The insertion by the Senate of facilities for Moody Air Force Base was accepted by the House conferees with an amendment. The amendment added appropriate authority for troop housing and

utilities at this installation. The troop housing at Barksdale Air Force Base, which had been deleted by the Senate, was reinserted by the conferees with the Senate receding. The House receded with respect to the three commissaries mentioned above. The classified facility under the Aircraft Control and Warning System was permitted to remain in the bill with the House receding.

Section 302 of the bill contains authority similar to that contained in section 102 under the "Army" title. The solution arrived at with respect to this section is identical with that for the similar Army authority. This item is dealt with in some greater detail below.

TITLE IV

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Under title IV, the Senate had inserted language which appeared to place operational authority in the Secretary of Defense with respect to defense missiles. As indicated under both the Army and Air Force portions of this statement, a new section was inserted in lieu of section 402 of the Senate version of the bill.

All conferees felt that the function of this new section and the purposes which it is designed to accomplish could best be described by setting out the exact language of this important change in the bill. This new language clarifies the original intent not to make authorizations or appropriations in operational matters directly to the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 402. The Secretary of Defense or his designee shall, prior to the utilization of the funds authorized by sections 102 and 302 of this Act for establishing or developing classified installations and facilities for defense missiles by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force, respectively, determine with respect to each defended area, which missile or combination of missiles will be employed in that area. In making such determination, the Secretary of Defense shall have the authority to transfer such funds as may be made available pursuant to the authorization contained in such sections for such installations and facilities, to the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, to enable such Secretaries to utilize the authority contained in such sections in accordance with such determinations.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The areas of disagreement under title V were not numerous but did involve matters of considerable importance.

The first item of disagreement related to section 506 of the Senate version of the bill relating to contracts entered into by the United States. The House and Senate conferees both had exactly the same purpose in mind and that was to insure that to the maximum extent possible, construction contracts within the Department of Defense shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of Yards and

Docks, Department of the Navy. The House conferees felt that the Senate language permitted a latitude which might fail to achieve the end sought and the Senate receded by accepting a new version of the language appearing at the first part of section 506. The new language agreed upon by the conferees is as follows:

SEC. 506. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States, its Territories and possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency * * *

The conferees wish to stress the importance of this portion of the bill since it is their firm belief that the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Yards and Docks are fully qualified by long experience in the administration of construction contracts and should, therefore, be fully utilized. It will be noted that the use of any other department or Government agency for the supervision of such contracts is limited to those instances where their jurisdiction and supervision by the Corps or the Bureau are "wholly impracticable."

The next area of disagreement related to the exception from the repealer language of the back-up authorization for rental guaranty housing. The Senate had deleted this item from the bill, but receded.

Section 512 of the bill had no counterpart in the House version. It is designed to permit all Wherry housing, whether mandatory or permissive, to be acquired by the military departments without the need for a line item in the annual construction bill.

Section 513, which also had no counterpart in the House version, limits the number of surplus commodity houses to 4,000 units for fiscal year 1959, and Capehart houses to 30,000 units for the same period. The House conferees made certain modifications to the Senate language which were acceptable to the Senate conferees. The principal change was the substitution for the word "constructed" of the words "contracted for." This will permit more orderly administration of the law and will express in better terms the actual intention of the Senate.

Subsection (d) of this section sets out the procedure which will be followed in the condemnation of Wherry housing projects. In great part, this subsection repeats existing law. It did, however, embody certain important differences from existing law, principally the mandatory requirement that the issue of just compensation for a Wherry project be determined by a commission of three persons to be appointed by the court. The Senate language, as stated above, required that compensation be determined by commissioners. Normal practice contemplates that the court exercise discretion as to whether commissioners shall be appointed or the matter of compensation be determined by a jury. The Senate conferees determined that their language should be made permissive rather than mandatory and as this is a privileged motion, the Senate changed its language from mandatory to permissive. Subsection (d) (2) was stricken from the bill in

view of the fact that the Senate's change of the word "shall" to the word "may" made this particular subsection unnecessary.

Section 516 of the Senate version extended until 1962 the period within which substandard family housing must be rehabilitated, converted to other use, or destroyed. The House conferees felt that this extension would tend to perpetuate a situation which everyone is agreed should be terminated at the very earliest possible date. The House conferees agreed, however, to a 1-year extension, until 1961 but wish to stress their strong interest in the prompt reconversion or destruction of substandard housing.

TITLE VI

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

The Senate amendment contained a provision authorizing the Secretaries of the military services, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to establish or develop Reserve facilities other than those authorized by section 603 providing that the total cost of such facilities by any service would not exceed 10 percent of the total amount authorized to be expended by that service and would not exceed the total amount authorized for such service.

The Senate amendment provides a flexibility for the military services which appears to be necessary. This is particularly true in that the bill is the first wherein reserve facility construction has been authorized by line item instead of by general authorizations as has been done in the past.

In addition, it will allow minor deviations from the line items contained in the bill in the event State or Federal authorities find that a project is needed prior to the submission of the next annual military construction bill.

The House recedes.

The House bill contained authorization for 35 National Guard armories at a cost of \$5,007,000. The Senate amendment added 108 armories at an additional cost of \$15,093,000.

The managers on the part of the House concurred with the Senate in that additional guard armories are needed. Furthermore, the States have appropriated and made available as matching funds \$35 million which cannot be used until the Federal Government contributes its share.

At the present time the National Guard Bureau estimates that more than 700 guard armories are still needed throughout the country. In view of this shortage it was believed that guard facilities in excess of those contained in the House bill should be authorized.

The House recedes.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,
L. C. ARENDS,
L. C. GAVIN,
BOB WILSON,
KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued August 6, 1958
For actions of August 5, 1958
85th-2d, No. 133

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....	24		
Appropriations.....	14,47,58,59		
Bird refuges.....	60		
Buildings.....	22,36,65		
CCC.....	15		
Contracts.....	10,56		
Dairy industry.....	49,63		
Defense production.....	29		
Desert land entries.....	20		
Economic situation.....	33,39	Fungicides.....	61
Education.....	12,55	Grains.....	42
Electrification.....	30,59	Hall of Fame.....	23
Expenditures.....	34	Herbicides.....	61
Farm income.....	39	Housing.....	64
Farm labor.....	6,17,37,62	Imports.....	25,52
Farm loans.....	2,16	Industrial uses.....	35
Farm organizations.....	50	Insecticides.....	61
Farm program.....	7,13,44	Lands.....	22,53
Federal-State relations.....	23	Legislative program.....	13
Fish and wildlife.....	61	Library services.....	38
Fisheries.....	27	Meat prices.....	46
Food additives.....	48	Military construction.....	4
Foreign aid.....	14,32	Monopolies.....	45,54,67
Foreign trade.....	15	Personnel.....	3
Forestry.....	18,22,40	Pesticides.....	61
Fruits and nuts.....	13,25,52	Property.....	57
		Public debt.....	1,13
		Public Law 480.....	4,15
		Public works.....	56
		Purchasing.....	26
		Reclamation.....	9,21,66
		Research.....	35,55
		Roads.....	19
		Saline water.....	8
		Small business.....	11,51
		Social security.....	41
		Soil conservation.....	43
		St. Lawrence Seaway.....	36
		Surplus disposal.....	15
		Transportation.....	5
		Travel.....	5
		Veto.....	47
		Water.....	31

HIGHLIGHTS: House debated bill to increase public debt limit. House and Senate committees reported bill to facilitate USDA insured loans. Rep. Mathews urged passage of House committee farm bill. House subcommittee ordered reported bill for transfer of employees to international organizations. Senate committee reported foreign aid appropriation bill.

HOUSE

1. PUBLIC DEBT. Debated H. R. 13580, to increase the public debt limit to \$285 billion. At the request of Rep. McCormack a vote on the bill was postponed until today, Aug. 6. pp. 14880, 14883-89, 14889-910, 14946
2. FARM LOANS. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 10965, to improve the insured-loans program under Title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (H. Rept. 2447). p. 14946
3. PERSONNEL. A subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported S. 4004, to encourage transfers of Federal employees for service with international organizations. p. D799
4. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Received the conference report on H. R. 13015, the military construction authorization bill (H. Rept. 2429). As reported by the conferees the bill limits the number of houses which may be contracted for with the use of foreign currencies accumulated under Public Law 480 to 4,000 units. pp. 14866-79, 14946
5. TRANSPORTATION; TRAVEL. Passed under suspension of the rules S. 377, to provide a 2-year statute of limitations on actions involving transportation of property and passengers of the U. S. Government. Substituted the language of H. R. 8742, as passed by the House earlier in the day, for that of S. 377. H. R. 8742 was laid on the table. pp. 14880-81, 14889
6. FARM LABOR. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 10360, to continue for 2 years the authority for the Attorney General to permit the importation of aliens for agricultural employment. pp. 14889, 14964
7. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Matthews explained the provisions of S. 4071, the farm bill, as reported by the House Agriculture Committee, and urged enactment of the Committee bill. pp. 14924
Rep. Hill inserted a letter from the National Wool Growers Assoc. urging passage of S. 4071 as reported by the House Agriculture Committee, and stated, "We feel certain that the conference committees can iron out major differences existing in the House and Senate versions of the farm bill and can develop legislation which will be acceptable to the administration." p. 14910
8. SALINE WATER. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment S. J. Res. 135, to provide for the construction by Interior of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, and municipal uses (H. Rept. 2450). p. 14946
9. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported S. 4009, without amendment, to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the Washoe reclamation project, Nev. and Calif. (H. Rept. 2451); and S. 3448, with amendment, to permit the Secretary of the Interior to authorize increases in the 160-acre limitation on the Seedskaadee Reclamation project (H. Rept. 2454). p. 14946
10. CONTRACTS. The Ways and Means Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11749, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years (H. Rept. 2466). p. 14947

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, AUGUST 5, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Ecclesiastes 8: 12: It shall be well with them that fear God.

Almighty God, we worship and adore Thee as the source of our well-being, the light of all that is true, the strength of all that is good, and the glory of all that is beautiful.

We beseech Thee to bless our minds with a reassuring vision of Thy gracious and beneficent purposes and our hearts with a splendor of faith and courage which nothing can ever eclipse or extinguish.

Grant that the principles of justice and righteousness, of friendship and brotherhood may be the foundation stones on which we are seeking to build an enduring civilization.

May our President, our Speaker, and our chosen Representatives be inspired with moral and spiritual power as they respond to the arduous task of leading mankind into the brightness and blessedness of a better day.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on August 4, 1958, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 13121. An act to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1283. An act for the relief of Charles T. Crowder;

H. R. 1317. An act for the relief of Ralph N. Meeks;

H. R. 1565. An act for the relief of Donald R. Pence;

H. R. 1602. An act for the relief of Lillian Cummings;

H. R. 2689. An act to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property to Stella Vusich;

H. R. 4183. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the refunding of the bonds of municipal corporations and public-

utility districts in the Territory of Alaska, to validate bonds which have heretofore been issued by a municipal corporation or any public-utility district in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes" (54 Stat. 14), approved June 17, 1940; to validate bonds which have heretofore been issued by any municipal corporation, any public-utility district or any school district in the Territory of Alaska; and for other purposes;

H. R. 4381. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 1215) to authorize the furnishing of headstones or markers in memory of members of the Armed Forces dying in the service, whose remains have not been recovered or identified or were buried at sea;

H. R. 4461. An act for the relief of Johnnie P. Saylor;

H. R. 4503. An act to provide that all interests of the United States in a certain tract of land formerly conveyed to it by the Commonwealth of Kentucky, shall be quitclaimed and returned to the Commonwealth of Kentucky;

H. R. 4675. An act to provide that certain employees under the jurisdiction of the commissioner of public lands and those under the jurisdiction of the board of harbor shall be subject to the civil service laws for commissioners of the Territory of Hawaii shall be subject to the civil-service laws of the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 4768. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the county San Jacinto, Tex., and authorizing named parties to bring suit for title and possession of same;

H. R. 5322. An act to extend certain veterans' benefits to or on behalf of dependent husbands and widowers of female veterans;

H. R. 5450. An act to authorize the enlargement of the administrative headquarters site for Isle Royale National Park, Houghton, Mich., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5904. An act for the relief of Thomson Contracting Co., Inc.;

H. R. 6038. An act to revise the boundary of the Kings Canyon National Park, in the State of California; and for other purposes;

H. R. 6198. An act to exclude certain lands from the Sequoia National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6274. An act to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall accept title to Grant's Tomb in New York, N. Y., and maintain it as the General Grant National Memorial;

H. R. 6593. An act for the relief of Mrs. Juanita Burna;

H. R. 6785. An act to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (48 U. S. C. 381);

H. R. 6970. An act for the relief of C. A. Nolan;

H. R. 7293. An act for the relief of Capt. Carl F. Dykeman;

H. R. 7790. An act to provide for the forfeiture of the right-of-way located within the State of California heretofore granted to the Atlantic & Pacific Railroad Co. by the United States;

H. R. 8046. An act for the relief of Joaquin A. Bazan;

H. R. 8211. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to

Joseph G. Pettet all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in the State of Montana;

H. R. 8231. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy at the United States Naval Gun Factory, Washington, D. C.;

H. R. 8233. An act for the relief of James L. McCabe;

H. R. 8313. An act for the relief of Wayne W. Powers, of Walla Walla, Wash.;

H. R. 8353. An act for the relief of S. A. Romine;

H. R. 8842. An act to quitclaim interest of the United States to certain land in Smith County, Miss., and to terminate restrictions against alienation thereon;

H. R. 8859. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the county of Humboldt, State of California;

H. R. 8980. An act to authorize an exchange of lands at Hot Springs National Park, Ark., and for other purposes;

H. R. 9006. An act for the relief of John C. Houghton, Jr.;

H. R. 9756. An act for the relief of Gerald K. Edwards, Lawrence R. Hitchcock, Thomas J. Davey, and Gerald H. Donnelly;

H. R. 9792. An act to validate the conveyance of certain land in the State of California by the Southern Pacific Co. to James Glono;

H. R. 9884. An act for the relief of Tamas Akos and Lilla Akos;

H. R. 9986. An act for the relief of 1st Lt. Luther A. Stamm;

H. R. 10094. An act for the relief of Western Union Telegraph Co.;

H. R. 10220. An act for the relief of William E. Nash;

H. R. 10416. An act for the relief of J. Henry Emen and others;

H. R. 10423. An act to grant the status of public lands to certain reef lands and vesting authority in the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii in respect of reef lands having the status of public lands;

H. R. 10461. An act to amend section 315 (m) of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to provide a special rate of compensation for certain blind veterans;

H. R. 10885. An act for the relief of Tibor Wollner;

H. R. 11008. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain land at Vicksburg National Military Park, Miss., and for other purposes;

H. R. 11108. An act for the relief of Mrs. Christina Tules;

H. R. 11203. An act for the relief of the State House, Inc.;

H. R. 11577. An act to increase from \$5 to \$10 per month for each \$1,000 national service life insurance in force the amount of total disability income benefits which may be purchased by insureds, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11611. An act for the relief of McCune C. Ott;

H. R. 11694. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Clallam County, Wash., to the Department of Natural Resources, State of Washington;

H. R. 11801. An act to amend sections 802 and 803 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to increase the burial allowance for deceased veterans from \$150 to \$250;

H. R. 11868. An act to amend the act of August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 632), relating to the rehabilitation and preservation of his-

toric properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11933. An act to provide for the conveyance of interests of the United States in and to uranium, thorium, and other materials in certain tracts of land situated in Jackson County, Miss.;

H. R. 12063. An act for the relief of Gerald Early;

H. R. 12261. An act for the relief of Lucian Roach, doing business as the Riverside Lumber Co.;

H. R. 12938. An act to provide for the conveyance of an interest of the United States in and to fissionable materials in a tract of land in Leon County, Fla.;

H. R. 13026. An act to validate the conveyance of certain land in the State of California by the Central Pacific Railway Co. and the Southern Pacific Co. to D'Arrigo Bros. Co. of California; and

H. J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1244. An act to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4059. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo;

H. R. 5949. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States located at the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo, Tex., to Potter County, Tex.;

H. R. 6283. An act for the relief of Dr. Gordon D. Hoople, Dr. David W. Brewer, and the estate of the late Dr. Irl H. Blaisdell;

H. R. 7710. An act to provide for the lump-sum payment of all accumulated and accrued annual leave of deceased employees;

H. R. 8606. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to annuities of survivors of employees who are elected as Members of Congress;

H. R. 8522. An act to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8831. An act for the relief of Joseph R. Burger;

H. R. 10277. An act to reduce from 15 to 13 inches the minimum width of paper in rolls which may be imported into the United States free of duty as standard newsprint paper;

H. J. Res. 424. Joint resolution to improve the administration of justice by authorizing the Judicial Conference of the United States to establish institutes and joint councils on sentencing, to provide additional methods of sentencing, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 610. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 611. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 122. An act for the relief of the estate of Sinclair G. Stanley;

S. 540. An act for the relief of the Board of National Mission of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

S. 2216. An act for the relief of John C. Walsh;

S. 2723. An act for the relief of George Kazuso Tohinoka;

S. 2836. An act for the relief of the town of Portsmouth, R. I.;

S. 2890. An act for the relief of Carmen Amella Piedra (Carmita Piedra);

S. 2905. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes;

S. 2955. An act for the relief of Kazuko Young;

S. 2973. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a fishery extension service in the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior for the purpose of carrying out cooperative fishery extension work with the States, Territories, and possessions;

S. 3219. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Graham Bonnalle;

S. 3321. An act for the relief of George E. Ketchum;

S. 3460. An act to govern the salaries and personnel practices for teachers, certain school officers, and other employees of the dependents schools of the Department of Defense in foreign countries, and for other purposes;

S. 3607. An act for the relief of Harvey L. Ford;

S. 3682. An act to authorize the sale or exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Pima County, Ariz., and for other purposes;

S. 3789. An act for the relief of Donald J. Marion;

S. 3882. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1948, chapter 791 (24 U. S. C. 279a), providing for the procurement and supply of Government headstones and markers;

S. 4010. An act to provide for the receipt and disbursement of funds, and for continuation of accounts when there is a vacancy in the office of the disbursing officer for the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes;

S. 4014. An act to require that a certain tract of land in Walla Walla, Wash., be disposed of on an individual lot basis;

S. 4021. An act to establish the United States Study Commission on the Savannah, Altamaha, St. Marys, Apalachicola-Chatahoochie, and Alabama-Coosa River Basins, and intervening areas;

S. 4039. An act to authorize the expenditure of funds through grants for support of scientific research, and for other purposes;

S. 4059. An act to amend Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 in order to change the name of the office established under such plan;

S. 4142. An act to amend chapter 41 of title 28 of the United States Code to provide for a Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 8-14, 1959, as National Children's Dental Health Week.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6239) entitled "An act to amend sections 1461 and 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. LANGER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1798) entitled "An act to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with re-

spect to certain small vessels operated by cooperatives or associations in transporting merchandise of members on a nonprofit basis to or from places within the inland waters of southeastern Alaska and Prince Rupert, British Columbia, or to or from places within said inland waters and places within the inland waters of the State of Washington," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. COTTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3880) entitled "An act to create a Civil Aeronautics Board and a Federal Aviation Agency, to provide for the regulation and promotion of civil aviation in such manner as to best foster its development and safety, and to provide for the safe and efficient use of the airspace by both civil and military aircraft," and agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. SCHOEPEL, and Mr. PAYNE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6006) entitled "An act to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 59-3.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. VINSON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2429)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I

"SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations

and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

"Inside the United States

"Technical service facilities

"(Ordnance Corps)

"Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,697,000.

"Detroit Arsenal, Michigan: Administrative facilities, \$5,666,000.

"Dedstone Arsenal, Alabama: Administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$8,529,000.

"Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois: Operational and training facilities, \$570,000.

"White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, research, development and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$7,931,000.

"(Quartermaster Corps)

"Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$4,630,000.

"(Chemical Corps)

"Army Chemical Center, Maryland: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

"Fort Detrick, Maryland: Troop housing, \$795,000.

"(Signal Corps)

"Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$9,098,000.

"(Corps of Engineers)

"Army Map Service, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, \$1,913,000.

"(Transportation Corps)

"Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,634,000.

"(Medical Corps)

"Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Troop housing, \$862,000.

"Field Forces Facilities

"(First Army area)

"Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, \$171,000.

"Fort Dix, New Jersey: Troop housing and utilities, \$3,749,000.

"(Second Army area)

"Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: Hospital facilities, family housing, and real estate, \$2,274,000.

"Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$516,000.

"Fort Meade, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, \$498,000.

"Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Supply facilities, \$43,000.

"(Third Army area)

"Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and family housing, \$3,454,000.

"Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$762,000.

"Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and administrative facilities, \$847,000.

"Fort McClellan, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, and hospital facilities, \$3,505,000.

"Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,406,000.

"(Fourth Army area)

"Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$13,734,000.

"Fort Hood, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,258,000.

"Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$3,227,000.

"(Fifth Army area)

"Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Troop housing, and family housing, \$783,000.

"Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,076,000.

"Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,084,000.

"(Sixth Army area)

"Camp Desert Rock, Nevada: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$374,000.

"Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,085,000.

"Fort Ord, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,733,000.

"Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, \$173,000.

"(Military Academy)

"United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Troop housing, medical facilities, and community facilities, \$5,844,000.

"(Armed Forces special weapons)

"Various locations: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$273,000.

"(Tactical installations support facilities)

"Various locations: Maintenance facilities, \$6,311,000.

"Outside Continental United States

"(Alaskan area)

"Fairbanks Permafrost Research Area: Real estate, \$7,000.

"(Pacific Command area)

"Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, \$240,000.

"Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Troop housing, \$593,000.

"Fort Shafter, Hawaii: Supply facilities, maintenance facilities, family housing, and community facilities, \$2,925,000.

"Korea: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$904,000.

"(United States Army, Europe)

"France: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,063,000.

"SEC. 102. Subject to the provisions of Section 402 hereof, the Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities, including those for defense missiles, by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$173,678,000.

"SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equip-

ment, in the total amount of \$17,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

"SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, and subject to the provisions of section 513 of this Act, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

"Various locations, France, 298 units.

"Vicenza, Italy, 371 units.

"Army Security Agency, location 13, 91 units.

"Gateway Communications Station, 174 units.

"(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

"Inside the United States

"Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, 316 units.

"Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York, 120 units.

"White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, 200 units.

"Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, 130 units.

"Fort Lee, Virginia, 435 units.

"Natick R&E, Massachusetts, 35 units.

"Fort Belvoir, Virginia, 618 units.

"Two Rock Ranch Station, California, 25 units.

"Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 50 units.

"Beaumont Army Hospital, Texas, 125 units.

"Fort Totten, New York, 130 units.

"Fort Campbell, Kentucky, 837 units.

"Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois, 65 units.

"Fort Rucker, Alabama, 400 units.

"Fort Stewart, Georgia, 73 units.

"Fort Bliss, Texas, 410 units.

"Fort Hood, Texas, 500 units.

"Fort Sill, Oklahoma, 349 units.

"Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 700 units.

"Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, 200 units.

"Fort Sheridan, Illinois, 50 units.

"Forts Baker and Barry, California, 98 units.

"Oakland Army Terminal, California, 88 units.

"Fort Lewis, Washington, 856 units.

"Branch United States Disciplinary Barracks, California, 160 units.

"United States Military Academy, New York, 156 units.

"Bossier Base, Louisiana, 200 units.

"Medina Base, Texas, 125 units.

"Sandia Base, New Mexico, 213 units.

"Army Air Defense Command Stations, 466 units.

"Outside of the United States

"Canal Zone, 330 units.

"Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, 385 units.

"Fort Shafter, Hawaii, 481 units: *Provided, however*, That no family housing units shall be constructed on Fort DeRussy.

"(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:

"Aberdeen Proving Ground, Aberdeen, Maryland, 796 units.

"Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 400 units.
"Fort Sam Houston, Texas, 840 units.
"Fort Sill, Oklahoma, 500 units.

"SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading 'Continental United States' in section 101 as follows:

"Under the subheading 'technical service facilities (Ordnance Corps)', with respect to Pueblo Ordnance Depot, Colorado, strike out '\$563,000' and insert in place thereof '\$600,000'.

"(b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts '\$44,407,000' and '\$134,075,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$44,444,000' and '\$134,112,000', respectively.

"SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading 'Continental United States' in section 101, as follows:

"(1) Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Ordnance Corps)', with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, strike out '\$2,865,000' and insert in place thereof '\$4,180,000'.

"(2) Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)', with respect to Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, strike out '\$615,000' and insert in place thereof '\$731,000'; and with respect to Ivnt Hill Farms Station, Virginia, strike out '\$695,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,022,000'.

"(3) Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Corps of Engineers)', with respect to Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois, strike out '\$1,822,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,815,000'.

"(4) Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Medical Corps)', with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, strike out '\$4,472,000' and insert in place thereof '\$6,714,000'.

"(5) Under the subheading 'Field Forces Facilities (Second Army Area)', with respect to Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, strike out '\$923,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,264,000'.

"(6) Under the subheading 'Field Forces Facilities (Fourth Army Area)', with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas, strike out '\$4,645,000' and insert in place thereof '\$4,965,000'; and with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike out '\$3,053,000' and insert in place thereof '\$3,454,000'.

"(7) Under the subheading 'Field Forces Facilities (Sixth Army Area)', with respect to Fort Ord, California, strike out '\$1,407,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,742,000'.

"(8) Under the subheading 'Field Forces Facilities (Military Academy)', with respect to the United States Military Academy, New York, strike out '\$756,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,171,000'.

"(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts '\$237,320,000' and '\$546,387,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$244,125,000' and '\$553,192,000', respectively.

"SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading 'Inside the United States' in section 101, as follows:

"(1) Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Ordnance Corps)', with respect to White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico, strike out '\$693,000' and insert in place thereof '\$735,000'.

"(2) Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Chemical Corps)', with respect to Camp Detrick, Maryland, strike out '\$913,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,074,000'; and with respect to Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, strike out '\$867,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,044,000'.

"(3) Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)', with respect to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, strike out

'\$6,856,000' and insert in place thereof '\$7,576,000'.

"(4) Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Corps of Engineers)', with respect to Fort Belvoir, Virginia, strike out '\$492,000' and insert in place thereof '\$940,000'.

"(5) Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Transportation Corps)', with respect to Fort Eustis, Virginia, strike out '\$1,231,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,436,000'.

"(6) Under the subheading 'Field Forces Facilities (First Army Area)', with respect to Fort Dix, New Jersey, strike out '\$54,000' and insert in place thereof '\$68,000'.

"(7) Under the subheading 'Field Forces Facilities (Second Army Area)', with respect to Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, strike out '\$5,885,000' and insert in place thereof '\$7,695,000'.

"(8) Under the subheading 'Field Forces Facilities (Third Army Area)', with respect to Fort Benning, Georgia, strike out '\$422,000' and insert in place thereof '\$616,000'; and with respect to Fort McClellan, Alabama, strike out '\$397,000' and insert in place thereof '\$527,000'.

"(9) Under the subheading 'Field Forces Facilities (Fourth Army Area)', with respect to Fort Hood, Texas, strike out '\$2,457,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,846,000'.

"(10) Under the subheading 'Field Forces Facilities (Fifth Army Area)', with respect to Fort Riley, Kansas, strike out '\$1,519,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,892,000'.

"(11) Under the subheading 'Field Forces Facilities (Sixth Army Area)', with respect to Fort Lewis, Washington, strike out '\$3,022,000' and insert in place thereof '\$3,596,000'; and with respect to Fort Ord, California, strike out '\$223,000' and insert in place thereof '\$319,000'.

"(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading 'Outside the United States' in section 101, as follows:

"Under the subheading '(Alaskan Area)', with respect to Wildwood Station (Kenai), strike out '\$352,000' and insert in place thereof '\$516,000'.

"(c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 402 the amounts '\$95,010,000', '\$35,763,000', and '\$334,104,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$100,343,000', '\$35,927,000', and '\$339,601,000', respectively.

"SEC. 108. (a) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended under the heading 'Inside the United States' in section 101 as follows:

"Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Corps of Engineers)' with respect to Cold Regions Laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire, strike out '\$2,496,000' and insert in place thereof '\$3,787,000'.

"(b) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts '\$115,624,000' and '\$293,103,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$116,915,000' and '\$294,394,000'.

"SEC. 109. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed, unless the Secretary of Defense finds after due investigation that such action would be inimical to the national security, to make available to the Administrator of the General Services Administration, or his designee, the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Texas. Upon such property being made available, the Administrator or his designee is authorized and directed to enter into a contract or contracts for the sale of such property in lots or in its entirety under public bid procedures and at not less than the fair market value and to convey by quitclaim deed, all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this Act, in and to such property to any legal person or group except Govern-

ment agencies or departments upon such terms and conditions as the Administrator or his designee determines to be in the public interest.

"(b) Any conveyance made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) hereof shall include the following conditions:

"(1) All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands to be conveyed shall be reserved to the United States;

"(2) The San Jacinto property shall be offered for sale within twenty-four months from the date of enactment of this Act;

"(3) Title in and to such property shall remain in the United States until full payment of the agreed purchase price is made.

"(c) In the event the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot is made available to the General Services Administration pursuant to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) hereof, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Army such sums as are necessary not to exceed \$40,000,000 to establish and construct, including land acquisition, replacement facilities to the extent required at Point-Aux-Pins, Alabama, or any other location selected by the Secretary of Defense.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to modify the requirements of section 2662 of title 10 of the United States Code relative to coming into agreement with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to real estate actions.

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

"Inside the United States

"Shipyard Facilities

"Naval Facility, Cape May, New Jersey: Operational and training facilities, \$141,000.

"Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Drydock, design, plans and engineering studies preliminary to initiation of construction, \$500,000.

"Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Operational and training facilities, \$6,000,000: *Provided, however,* That no more than \$500,000 of this sum shall be utilized for protective works until the Secretary of the Navy determines in his judgment that sufficient action has been taken or arrangements made to arrest further subsidence of the shipyard.

"Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Operational and training facilities, \$2,247,000.

"Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California: Operational and training facilities, \$766,000.

"Fleet Base Facilities

"Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,709,000.

"Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$2,546,000.

"Aviation Facilities

"(Naval air training stations)

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Troop housing, \$1,041,000.

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$14,940,000.

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$4,679,000.

"(Fleet support air stations)

"Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational and training facilities, \$114,000.

"Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Maintenance facilities, \$1,252,000.

"Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, California: Operational and training facilities, \$47,000.

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Operational and training facilities, \$30,000.

"Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Fentress, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

"Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, administrative facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$11,215,000.

"Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational and training facilities, \$74,000.

"Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$15,823,000.

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$9,892,000.

"Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, \$7,000,000.

"Naval Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

"(Marine Corps air stations)

"Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities and real estate, \$4,352,000.

"Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational and training facilities and real estate, \$8,946,000.

"Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,067,000.

"Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, \$1,003,000.

"Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Operational and training facilities, \$2,158,000.

"(Special purpose air stations)

"Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, utilities, and operational and training facilities at the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland, \$17,666,000.

"Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing (including operational and training facilities and troop housing on San Nicolas Island; and maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements at Camp Cooke), \$13,841,000.

"Supply Facilities

"Naval Supply Depot, Newport, Rhode Island: Utilities, \$2,210,000.

"Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Administrative facilities, \$128,000.

"Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California: Administrative facilities, \$146,000.

"Marine Corps Facilities

"Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Operational and training facilities, \$280,000.

"Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Utilities, \$462,000.

"Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,138,000.

"Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$168,000.

"Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California: Utilities, \$206,000.

"Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Maintenance facilities, \$241,000.

"Ordnance Facilities

"Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

"Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California: Supply facilities, \$129,000.

"Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord, California: Maintenance facilities, \$2,517,000.

"Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, California: Research, development, and test facilities, \$510,000.

"Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Virginia: Research, development, and test facilities, \$44,000.

"Naval Ammunition Depot, Hingham, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, \$694,000.

"Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, \$601,000.

"Service School Facilities

"Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Troop housing, \$14,200,000.

"Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$1,184,000.

"Naval Receiving Station, District of Columbia: Operational facilities, \$650,000.

"Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Operational and training facilities, \$1,368,000.

"Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational and training facilities, \$273,000.

"Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$4,643,000.

"Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Operational and training facilities, \$4,199,000.

"Medical Facilities

"National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland: Hospital and medical facilities, \$8,503,000.

"Communication Facilities

"Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational and training facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$38,654,000.

"Office of Naval Research Facilities

"Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development, and test facilities, \$192,000.

"Outside the United States

"Shipyard Facilities

"Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, \$159,000.

"Aviation Facilities

"Naval Air Station, Agana, Mariana Islands: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$4,414,000.

"Naval Station, Bermuda, British West Indies: Operational and training facilities, \$683,000.

"Naval Air Station, Ford Island, Territory of Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, \$1,271,000.

"Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Supply facilities, \$165,000.

"Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, \$3,824,000.

"Supply Facilities

"Naval Supply Depot, Guam, Mariana Islands: Supply facilities, \$3,060,000.

"Communication Facilities

"Naval Communication Unit Number Three, Asmara, Eritrea: Operational and training facilities, \$1,180,000.

"Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Operational and training facilities, \$219,000.

"Naval Radio Facility, Port Lyautey, Morocco: Operational and training facilities, \$519,000.

"Yards and Docks Facilities

"Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$890,000.

"SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$75,301,000.

"SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop naval installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$17,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

"SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, and subject to the provisions of section 513 of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation: "Naval Magazine, Cartagena, Spain, 46 units, and community facilities.

"Naval Magazine, El Ferrol, Spain, 45 units, and community facilities.

"Naval Air Station, Port Lyautey, Morocco, 330 units.

"Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Italy, 122 units, and community facilities.

"(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

"Inside the United States

"Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, 277 units.

"Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, 800 units.

"Naval Facility, Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, 27 units.

"Naval Facility, Centerville, California, 24 units.

"Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, 849 units.

"Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oregon, 24 units.

"Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, 425 units.

"Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 800 units.

"Naval Facility, Nantucket, Massachusetts, 19 units.

"Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500 units.

"Naval Facility, Pacific Beach, Washington, 30 units.

"Naval Facility, Point Sur, California, 24 units.

"Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, 550 units.

"Naval Ordnance Missile Test Facility, White Sands Proving Grounds, New Mexico, 51 units.

"Naval Base, San Diego, California, 1,000 units, to be constructed on land, including the following tracts which are hereby authorized and directed to be transferred to the Department of the Navy by the Administrator of General Services without reimbursement: GSA H-Cal 546B; and GSA H-Cal 587.

"Outside of the United States"

"Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 1,140 units.

"Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, Headquarters, Camp H. M. Smith, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 168 units.

"Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands, 220 units.

"Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 650 units.

"Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 80 units.

"Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 650 units.

"(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:

"Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, 1,562 units.

"Marine Corps Training Center, Twentynine Palms, California, 493 units.

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, 96 units.

"Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Maryland, 385 units.

"Naval Station, Green Cove Springs, Florida, 392 units.

"Squantum Gardens, Massachusetts, 150 units.

"Sec. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading 'Continental United States' in section 201 as follows:

"Under the subheading 'Medical facilities', with respect to the Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Virginia, Area, strike out '\$12,815,000' and insert in place thereof '\$13,979,000'.

"(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts '\$139,143,000' and '\$266,927,000', and inserting respectively in place thereof '\$140,307,000' and '\$268,091,000'.

"Sec. 206. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, '\$70,656,000', and inserting in place thereof '\$72,785,000'.

"(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts '\$70,656,000', and '\$210,704,000' and inserting respectively in place thereof '\$72,785,000', and '\$212,833,000'.

"Sec. 207. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading 'Continental United States' in section 201 as follows:

"(1) Under the subheading 'Marine Corps facilities', with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, strike out '\$648,000' and insert in place thereof '\$778,000'.

"(2) Under the subheading 'Ordnance facilities', with respect to the Naval Underwater Ordnance Station, Newport, Rhode Island, strike out '\$370,000' and insert in place thereof '\$411,000'.

"(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading 'Outside Continental United States' in section 201, as follows:

"Under subheading 'Aviation facilities', with respect to the Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands, by striking out '\$6,

525,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$9,063,000' and with respect to the Naval Station, Argentina, Newfoundland, by striking out '\$8,589,800' and inserting in place thereof '\$9,089,800'.

"(c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts '\$308,463,600', '\$108,365,300', and '\$575,592,300' and inserting respectively in place thereof '\$308,634,600', '\$111,403,300', and '\$578,801,300'.

"Sec. 208. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading 'Inside the United States' in section 201, as follows:

"(1) Under the subheading 'Fleet base facilities', with respect to the Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island, strike out '\$11,672,000' and insert in place thereof '\$14,601,000'.

"(2) Under the subheading 'Aviation facilities (Naval Air Training Stations)', with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas, strike out '\$2,247,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,569,000'; and with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, strike out '\$8,231,000' and insert in place thereof '\$9,141,000'.

"(3) Under the subheading 'aviation facilities (Marine Corps Air Stations)', with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, strike out '\$170,000' and insert in place thereof '\$273,000'.

"(4) Under the subheading 'Service school facilities', with respect to the Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia, strike out '\$237,000' and insert in place thereof '\$300,000', and with respect to the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, strike out '\$8,413,000' and insert in place thereof '\$10,613,000'.

"(5) Under the subheading 'Medical facilities', with respect to the Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Illinois, strike out '\$12,730,000' and insert in place thereof '\$14,754,000'.

"(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 203 '\$85,939,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$86,711,000'.

"(c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts '\$303,453,000', '\$85,939,000', and '\$451,393,000' and inserting respectively in place thereof '\$312,004,000', '\$86,711,000', and '\$460,716,000'.

"Sec. 209. Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended under the heading 'Inside the United States' in section 201 as follows:

"Under the subheading 'Aviation Facilities (Special Purpose Air Stations)', with respect to the Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, insert before '\$7,669,000' the words 'and land acquisition'.

"TITLE III"

"Sec. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

"Inside the United States"

"Air Defense Command"

"Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$2,649,000.

"Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Troop housing, \$990,000.

"Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$10,659,000.

"Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, sup-

ply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,176,000.

"K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$10,673,000.

"Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Community facilities, and utilities, \$229,000.

"Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Saint Marie, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, \$9,948,000.

"McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$935,000.

"Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,721,000.

"Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,689,000.

"Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Medical facilities, \$122,000.

"Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and real estate, \$2,799,000.

"Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,579,000.

"Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

"Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Troop housing, and ground improvements, \$795,000.

"Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$3,992,000.

"Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$6,696,000.

"Air Materiel Command"

"Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$975,000.

"Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$1,177,000.

"Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,746,000.

"Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Utilities, \$157,000.

"Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania: Supply facilities, \$94,000.

"McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, \$1,560,000.

"Memphis General Depot, Memphis, Tennessee: Administrative facilities, \$1,464,000.

"Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California: Supply facilities, \$658,000.

"Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$6,169,000.

"Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,362,000.

"Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$5,196,000.

"Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, \$11,037,000.

"Air Research and Development Command

"Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, \$981,000.

"Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$10,109,000.

"Holoman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$1,650,000.

"Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$481,000.

"Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, \$165,000.

"Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,884,000.

"School of Aviation Medicine

"School of Aviation Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvement, \$12,000,000.

"Air Training Command

"Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$979,000.

"Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$1,584,000.

"Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Troop housing, \$640,000.

"Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Troop housing, \$400,000.

"Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$208,000.

"James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Troop housing, \$750,000.

"Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$441,000.

"Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,213,000.

"McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, \$2,119,000.

"Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,432,000.

"Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Maintenance facilities, \$358,000.

"Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance facilities, \$319,000.

"Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$245,000.

"Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

"Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$571,000.

"Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance of facilities, \$1,770,000.

"Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$3,081,000.

"Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,361,000.

"Continental Air Command

"Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Troop housing, \$1,805,000.

"Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$11,589,000.

"Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Utilities, \$172,000.

"Headquarters Command

"Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$18,937,000.

"Military Air Transport Service

"Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, \$78,000.

"Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$2,874,000.

"McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,901,000.

"Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Troop housing, \$423,000.

"Strategic Air Command

"Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,051,000.

"Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,280,000.

"Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,868,000.

"Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,080,000.

"Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,654,000.

"Brunswick Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$11,417,000.

"Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,996,000.

"Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$2,257,000.

"Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$4,183,000.

"Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,734,000.

"Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,939,000.

"Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,174,000.

"Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,404,000.

"Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,346,000.

"Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,931,000.

"Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$4,094,000.

"Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, supply

facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,703,000.

"Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,489,000.

"Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,493,000.

"Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$3,401,000.

"Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,795,000.

"Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$897,000.

"Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,250,000.

"Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,463,000.

"Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$11,716,000.

"Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$3,774,000.

"MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,577,000.

"Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,832,000.

"March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$3,344,000.

"McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,137,000.

"Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$1,039,000.

"Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$3,265,000.

"Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$940,000.

"Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$208,000.

"Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$15,552,000.

"Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,352,000.

"Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,997,000.

"Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$8,431,000.

"Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Troop housing, \$945,000.

"Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,185,000.

"Tactical Air Command

"George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Maintenance facilities, \$536,000.

"Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,371,000.

"Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,650,000.

"Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Troop housing, \$591,000.

"Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities; troop housing, and utilities, \$4,707,000.

"Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,339,000.

"Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,474,000.

"Special Facilities

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$563,000.

"Aircraft Control and Warning System

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$169,833,000.

"Outside the United States

"Air Materiel Command

"Various locations: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$696,000.

"Alaskan Air Command

"Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, \$380,000.

"Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, \$710,000.

"King Salmon Airport: Operational and training facilities, \$340,000.

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$24,986,000.

"Caribbean Air Command

"Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and training facilities, \$1,540,000.

"Military Air Transport Service

"Various locations: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$5,347,000.

"Pacific Air Forces

"Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$144,000.

"Midway Island: Supply facilities, \$839,000.

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$15,688,000.

"Strategic Air Command

"Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,508,000.

"Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$643,000.

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$21,431,000.

"United States Air Forces in Europe

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$19,952,000.

"Aircraft Control and Warning System

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply

facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$29,135,000.

"Special Facilities

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$315,000.

"Sec. 302. Subject to the provisions of Section 402 hereof, the Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$269,100,000.

"Sec. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$17,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

"Sec. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, and subject to the provisions of section 513 of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation: "Lajes Field, Azores, 306 units.

"Kindley Air Force Base, Bermuda, 300 units.

"Laon, France, 102 units.

"Keflavik Airport, Iceland, 300 units.

"Benquerir Airport, Morocco, 248 units.

"Sidi Slimane Air Base, Morocco, 295 units.

"Clark Air Force Base, Philippines, 900 units.

"Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, 200 units.

"Madrid-Torrejon area, Spain, 460 units.

"Moron-San Pablo area, Spain, 40 units.

"Various locations, Spain, 120 units, and community facilities.

"Zaragoza Air Base, Spain, 176 units.

"Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 50 units.

"Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 190 units.

"Bruntlingthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 93 units.

"Brize Norton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 215 units.

"Chelveston RAF Station, United Kingdom, 79 units.

"Chicksands Priory RAF Station, United Kingdom, 83 units.

"Fairford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 177 units.

"High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 110 units.

"Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 55 units, and community facilities.

"Stansted-Mountfitchet RAF Station, United Kingdom, 22 units.

"Upper Heyford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 259 units.

"Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, 416 units.

"(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 616), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

"Inside the United States

"Camp Adair Air Force Station, Oregon, 150 units.

"Amarillo Air Force Base, Texas, 500 units.

"Beale Air Force Base, California, 970 units.

"Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 250 units.

"Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, 450 units.

"Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 536 units.

"Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 50 units.

"Custer Air Force Station, Michigan, 169 units.

"Donaldson Air Force Base, South Carolina, 275 units.

"Cooke Air Force Base, California, 525 units.

"Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 500 units.

"Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 530 units.

"Duluth Municipal Airport, Minnesota, 365 units.

"Edwards Air Force Base, California, 778 units.

"Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 220 units.

"Forbes Air Force Base, Kansas, 414 units.

"Fort Lee Air Force Station, Virginia, 154 units.

"Geiger Field, Washington, 168 units.

"Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 460 units.

"Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 744 units.

"Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, 270 units.

"Hamilton Air Force Base, California, 550 units.

"Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, 400 units.

"James Connally Air Force Base, Texas, 366 units.

"Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 290 units.

"Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 475 units.

"K. I. Sawyer Airport, Michigan, 595 units.

"Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, 490 units.

"Lake Charles Air Force Base, Louisiana, 300 units.

"Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, 500 units.

"Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 200 units.

"Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio, 400 units.

"Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 150 units.

"Mather Air Force Base, California, 220 units.

"McChord Air Force Base, Washington, 1,000 units.

"McClellan Air Force Base, California, 540 units.

"McCoy Air Force Base, Florida, 668 units.

"McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, 1,450 units.

"Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 932 units.

"Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 270 units.

"Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, 200 units.

"Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, New York, 290 units.

"Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 616 units.

"Oxnard Air Force Base, California, 315 units.

"Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, 483 units.

"Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.

"Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wisconsin, 900 units.

"Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Missouri, 610 units.

"Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, 150 units.

"Selfridge Air Force Base, Michigan, 580 units.

"Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas, 500 units.

"Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa, 235 units.

"Stewart Air Force Base, New York, 300 units.

"Suffolk County Air Force Base, New York, 220 units.

"Syracuse Air Force Station, New York, 216 units.

"Topsham Air Force Station, Maine, 177 units.

"Truax Field, Wisconsin, 280 units.

"Turner Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units.

"United States Air Force Academy, Colorado, 300 units.

"Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 230 units.

"Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts, 310 units.

"Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 154 units.

"Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, 150 units.

"Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 618 units.

"Outside the United States

"Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, 1,050 units.

"Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, 600 units.

"(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:

"Brookley Air Force Base, Alabama, 175 units.

"Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, 600 units.

"Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 225 units.

"Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, 550 units.

"Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, 500 units.

"Hunter Air Force Base, Georgia, 500 units.

"Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, 592 units.

"Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, 480 units.

"March Air Force Base, California, 644 units.

"Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, 250 units.

"Mitchel Air Force Base, New York, 628 units.

"Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, 612 units.

"Reese Air Force Base, Texas, 418 units.

"Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, 400 units.

"Walker Air Force Base, New Mexico, 800 units.

"Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, 2,000 units.

"Sec. 305. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended, under the heading 'Continental United States' in section 301 as follows:

"Under the subheading 'Air Defense Command', with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts, strike out '\$6,076,000', and insert in place thereof '\$6,522,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Air Material Command', with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out '\$14,508,000' and insert in place thereof '\$15,800,000'.

"(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts '\$824,300,000' and '\$1,363,189,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$826,038,000' and '\$1,364,927,000', respectively.

"Sec. 306. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended,

under the heading 'Inside the United States', in section 301, as follows:

"Under the subheading 'Air Defense Command'—

"(1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota, strike out '\$1,469,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,636,000'.

"(2) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts, strike out '\$11,577,000' and insert in place thereof '\$13,341,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Air Material Command', with respect to Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, strike out '\$1,339,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,661,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Air Materiel Command', with respect to James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas, strike out '\$4,687,000' and insert in place thereof '\$5,301,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Strategic Air Command' with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out '\$1,586,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,726,000'.

"(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the amounts '\$811,342,000' and '\$1,447,950,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$814,349,000' and '\$1,450,957,000', respectively.

"Sec. 307. (a) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended, under the heading 'Inside the United States' in section 301, as follows:

"Under the subheading 'Air Defense Command'—

"(1) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana, strike out '\$2,048,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,390,000'.

"(2) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri, strike out '\$1,100,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,348,000'.

"(3) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out '\$6,804,000' and insert in place thereof '\$8,507,000'.

"(4) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts, strike out '\$559,000' and insert in place thereof '\$615,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Air Materiel Command', with respect to Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, strike out '\$899,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,128,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Air Training Command', with respect to Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas, strike out '\$460,000' and insert in place thereof '\$637,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Strategic Air Command'—

"(1) with respect to Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana, strike out '\$3,344,000' and insert in place thereof '\$3,633,000'.

"(2) with respect to Beale Air Base, Marysville, California, strike out '\$7,458,000' and insert in place thereof '\$9,087,000'.

"(3) with respect to MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida, strike out '\$936,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,268,000'.

"(4) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out '\$2,344,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,947,000'.

"(5) with respect to Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri, strike out '\$235,000' and insert in place thereof '\$306,000'.

"(b) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts '\$394,076,000' and '\$601,781,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$399,755,000' and '\$607,460,000', respectively.

"Sec. 308. (a) Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended, under the heading 'Alert and Dispersal of Strategic Air Command Forces' in section 1, as follows:

"(1) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota,

strike out '\$895,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,892,000'.

"(2) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out '\$867,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,479,000'.

"(3) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out '\$4,380,000' and insert in place thereof '\$5,479,000'.

"(4) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out '\$690,000' and insert in place thereof '\$969,000'.

"(b) Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended by striking out in section 3 the amount '\$549,670,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$552,657,000'.

"Sec. 309. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure '\$135,425,000' and inserting in place thereof the figure '\$139,797,000'.

"Sec. 310. The last paragraph under the heading 'Research and Development Command' in title III of Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress (69 Stat. 342), is amended to read as follows:

"Various Locations: Research, development, and operational facilities (including not more than \$357,000 for an off-base roadway approximately ten miles in length in the vicinity of the north boundary of Cape Canaveral—an auxiliary to Patrick Air Force Base) \$20,000,000."

"The amendment made by this section is effective from March 1, 1956.

"TITLE IV

"Sec. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities required for advanced research projects and in connection therewith may acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000.

"Sec. 402. The Secretary of Defense or his designee shall, prior to the utilization of the funds authorized by Sections 102 and 302 of this Act for establishing or developing classified military installations and facilities for defense missiles by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force, respectively, determine with respect to each defended area, which missile or combination of missiles will be employed in that area. In making such determination, the Secretary of Defense shall have the authority to transfer such funds as may be made available pursuant to the authorizations contained in such sections for such installations and facilities, to the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, to enable such Secretaries to utilize the authority contained in such sections in accordance with such determinations.

"Sec. 403. The Secretary of Defense shall report in detail semiannually to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to the exercise of the authority granted by this title.

"TITLE V

"General provisions

"Sec. 501. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 529, 40 U. S. C. 259, 267), and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as

amended (40 U. S. C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

"Sec. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

"(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$109,556,000; outside the United States, \$8,732,000; section 102, \$173,678,000; section 103, \$17,500,000; or a total of \$309,466,000.

"(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$216,809,000; outside the United States, \$16,384,000; section 202, \$75,301,000; section 203, \$17,500,000; or a total of \$325,994,000.

"(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$542,161,000; outside the United States, \$123,654,000; section 302, \$269,100,000; section 303, \$17,500,000; or a total of \$952,415,000.

"(4) for title IV: \$50,000,000.

"Sec. 503. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

"Sec. 504. Any outstanding authority heretofore provided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991), for the provision of family housing shall be available for the construction of family housing at any installations for which appropriated fund family housing is authorized to be constructed under titles I and III of this Act.

"Sec. 505. Whenever—

"(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

"(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts; the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

"Sec. 506. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States, its territories and possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another Department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and section 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547, 551). The Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

"Sec. 507. As of July 1, 1959, all authorization for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations

and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 4, 1956, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

"(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

"(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1959, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

"(3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

"(4) the authorizations for public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in sections 2231–2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended (50 U. S. C. 832, 833, 885, 886);

"(5) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$30,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

"(6) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

"(7) the authorization for public works and for the appropriation of funds that are contained in the Act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended; and

"(8) notwithstanding the provision of section 506 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 558), the authorization for:

"(a) jet engine test cells in the amount of \$1,850,000 at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk Virginia, that is contained in title II, section 201 under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading 'Aviation Facilities' of the Act of August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 440, 422), as amended;

"(b) ammunition storage facilities in the amount of \$225,000 at the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California; navigational aids in the amount of \$590,000 at the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California; research and development facilities in the amount of \$1,804,000 at the Naval Air Turbine Test Station, Trenton, New Jersey; and navigational aids in the amount of \$400,000 at the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington; that are contained in title II, section 201, under the heading, 'Continental United States' and subheading 'aviation facilities' of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 540), as amended;

"(c) the development of aviation ordnance facilities in the amount of \$2,638,000 that is contained in title II, section 202, of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 543), as amended.

"Sec. 508. Section 408 (b) of the Act of June 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 236, 245), is hereby repealed.

"Sec. 509. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 515. During fiscal years 1958 through and including 1961, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than 5,000 of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out

of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit.

"Sec. 510. Section 406 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1015), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 406. (a) The Secretary of a military department may acquire any interest in land that—

"(1) he or his designee determines is needed in the interest of national defense; and

"(2) does not cost more than \$25,000 (exclusive of administrative costs and the amounts of any deficiency judgments).

This section does not authorize the acquisition, as part of the same project, of two or more contiguous parcels of land that together cost more than \$25,000.

"Sec. 511. Section 408 (a) of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(5) No determination that a project is urgency required shall be necessary for projects, the cost of which is not in excess of \$5,000.

"Sec. 512. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization Act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) housing units leased, utilizing available operation and maintenance appropriations, for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than 5 years pursuant to the provisions of section 417 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1018).

"Sec. 513. (a) Notwithstanding the authorizations for the construction of family housing contained in subsections 104 (a), 204 (a) and 304 (a) of this Act, the total number of units of family housing contracted for during fiscal year 1959 pursuant to the authority contained in such subsections shall not exceed a total of four thousand units. The Secretary of Defense shall determine the total number of units to be constructed by each of the military services in conformity with the provisions of this subsection.

"(b) Notwithstanding the authorizations for the construction of family housing contained in subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b) of this Act, the total number of units of family housing contracted for during fiscal year 1959 pursuant to the authority contained in such subsections shall not exceed a total of thirty thousand units. The Secretary of Defense shall determine the total number of units to be constructed by each of the military services in conformity with the provisions of this subsection. The Secretaries of the three military departments, or the designee of each, shall promptly notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives of any determination made hereunder as it affects each such department.

"(c) To the extent that any of the authorizations contained in subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b) of this Act to construct housing at locations specified therein are not utilized, such authorizations may be exercised to construct housing at other locations, except that (1) the total number of housing units to be constructed under the authority of this subsection by any service shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total number of units authorized to be constructed by that service under subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), or 304 (b), as the

case may be, and (2) the total number of units constructed by the three services pursuant to this authority shall not, when added to the total number of units constructed pursuant to the authority contained in subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b), exceed the total number of units authorized to be contracted for by subsection (b) hereof.

"(d) Section 404 (c) of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) (1). Condemnation proceedings instituted pursuant to this section shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 357; 40 U. S. C. 257), as amended, or any other applicable Federal statute. Before any such condemnation proceedings are instituted, an effort shall be made to acquire the property involved by negotiation. In any such condemnation proceedings, and in the interests of expedition, the issue of just compensation may be determined by a commission of three qualified, disinterested persons to be appointed by the court. Any commission appointed hereunder shall have the powers of a master provided in subdivision (c) of rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and proceedings before it shall be governed by the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (d) of such rule. Its action and report shall be determined by a majority and its findings and report shall have the effect, and be dealt with by the court in accordance with the practice prescribed in paragraph (2) of subdivision (e) of such rule. Trial of all issues, other than just compensation, shall be by the court.

"(2) In any condemnation proceedings instituted pursuant to this section, the court shall not order the party in possession to surrender possession in advance of final judgment unless a declaration of taking has been filed, and a deposit of the amount estimated to be just compensation has been made, under the first section of the Act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421), providing for such declarations. Unless title is in dispute, the court, upon application, shall promptly pay to the owner at least 75 per centum of the amount so deposited, but such payment shall be made without prejudice to any party to the proceeding. In the event that condemnation proceedings are instituted in accordance with procedures under such Act of February 26, 1931, the court shall order that the amount deposited shall be paid in a lump sum or over a period not exceeding five years in accordance with stipulations executed by the parties in the proceedings. In connection with condemnation proceedings which do not utilize the procedures under such Act, the Secretary or his designee, after final judgment of the court, may pay or agree to pay in a lump sum or, in accordance with stipulations executed by the parties to the proceedings, over a period not exceeding five years the difference between the outstanding principal obligation, plus accrued interest, and the price for the property fixed by the court. Unless such payment is made in a lump sum, the unpaid balance thereof shall bear interest at the rate of 4 per centum per annum."

"SEC. 514. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States at a unit cost in excess of—

"(1) \$32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

"(2) \$6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

"(3) \$1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

"(4) \$8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

"unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, ap-

plication to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

"SEC. 515. Titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this Act may be cited as the 'Military Construction Act of 1958'.

"SEC. 516. Section 407 (e) of Public Law 85-241, approved August 30, 1957, is amended by striking out 'July 1, 1960' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1961'.

"TITLE VI

"Reserve Forces Facilities

"SEC. 601. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) That part of section 2233 (a) that precedes clause (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2233. Acquisition

"(a) Subject to sections 2233a, 2234, 2235, 2236, and 2238 of this title and subsection (c) of this section, the Secretary of Defense may—

"(2) Section 2233 is amended by adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

"(e) The Secretary of Defense may procure advance planning, construction design, and architectural services in connection with facilities to be established or developed under this chapter which are not otherwise authorized by law.

"(f) Facilities authorized by subsection (a) shall not be considered 'military public works' under the provisions of the military construction authorization acts that repeal prior authorizations for military public works."

"(3) The following new section is inserted after section 2233:

"§ 2233a. Limitation

"No expenditure or contribution that is more than \$50,000 may be made under section 2233 of this title for any facility that has not been authorized by a law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces. This requirement does not apply to the following:

"(a) Facilities acquired by lease.

"(b) Facilities acquired, constructed, expanded, rehabilitated, converted, or equipped to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed, where the Senate and the House of Representatives have been notified of that action."

"(4) The analysis of chapter 133 is amended by inserting the following new item:

"2233a. Limitation."

"SEC. 602. (a) Section 3 of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended by paragraph (a) of the Act of August 9, 1955, chapter 662 (69 Stat. 593), and by section 2 of the Act of August 29, 1957, Public Law 85-215 (71 Stat. 489), is amended by striking out the words 'in an amount not to exceed \$580,000,000 over a period of the next eight fiscal years commencing with fiscal year 1951,'

"(b) Section 3 (a) of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended by section 414 of the Act of August 3, 1956, chapter 939 (70 Stat. 1018), is amended by striking out the words 'and without regard to the monetary limitation otherwise imposed by this section'.

"SEC. 603. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

"(1) For Department of the Navy:

"Naval Reserve (aviation)

"Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Georgia: Training facilities, \$480,000.

"Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Supply facilities and utilities, \$259,000.

"Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$652,000.

"Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Navigational aids and utilities, \$179,000.

"Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Airfield lighting, \$147,000.

"Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Operational and training facilities, liquid fueling and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting, and land acquisition, \$1,992,000.

"Naval Air Station, New Orleans (Alvin Callender Field), Louisiana: Administrative facilities, community facilities, navigational aids, operational facilities, supply facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,447,000.

"Naval Air Station, New York, New York: Airfield lighting, \$130,000.

"Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$652,000.

"Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, \$570,000.

"Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Utilities, \$407,000.

"Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Utilities, \$99,000.

"Naval Reserve (surface)

"Alameda, California: Waterfront operational facilities, \$128,000.

"Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Bloomington, Indiana: Training facilities, \$95,000.

"Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Boston, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$108,000.

"Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Centralia, Washington: Training facilities, \$81,000.

"Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Chillicothe, Ohio: Training facilities, \$100,000.

"Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Danville, Kentucky: Training facilities, \$84,000.

"Naval Reserve Training Center, Dunkirk, New York: Training facilities, \$79,000.

"Fort Schuyler, New York: Waterfront operational facilities, \$120,000.

"Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Hayward, California: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$99,000.

"Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Honolulu, Hawaii: Training facilities, \$515,000.

"Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Iowa City, Iowa: Training facilities, \$97,000.

"Master Control Radio Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Communications, \$210,000.

"Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Olympia (Tumwater), Washington: Training facilities, \$47,000.

"Naval Reserve Training Center, Pasadena, California: Training facilities, \$132,000.

"Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Port Chicago, California: Training facilities, \$94,000.

"Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Jose, California: Land acquisition, \$78,000.

"Saint Petersburg, Florida: Waterfront operational facilities, \$26,000.

"Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Steubenville, Ohio: Land acquisition, \$18,000.

"Naval Reserve Training Center, White Oak (Lewiston), Maryland: Training facilities, \$557,000.

"Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Yakima, Washington: Training facilities, \$48,000.

"Marine Corps Reserve (ground)

"Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Lynchburg, Virginia: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$388,000.

"Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Memphis, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$153,000.

"Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Moline, Illinois: Training facilities, \$152,000.

"Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Pasadena, California: Training facilities, \$163,000.

"(2) For Department of the Air Force:

"Air Force Reserve

"Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, \$129,000.

"Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$3,174,000.

"Bates Field, Mobile, Alabama: Maintenance facility, \$97,000.

"Bradley Field, Windsor Locks, Connecticut: Maintenance facility and utilities and ground improvements, \$160,000.

"Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Maintenance facility, and supply facility, \$325,000.

"General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Maintenance facility, and operational and training facilities, \$173,000.

"Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, New Hampshire: Operational and training facilities, \$180,000.

"Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Belton, Missouri: Operational and training facilities, \$101,000.

"Naval Air Station (Alvin Callender Field), Orleans Parish, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities, \$622,000.

"Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facility, \$93,000.

"Air National Guard of the United States

"Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, and hospital and medical facilities, \$171,000.

"Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, \$740,000.

"Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel, Minnesota: Site improvements, \$500,000.

"Birmingham Municipal Airport, Birmingham, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, \$150,000.

"Byrd Field, Richmond, Virginia: Supply facilities, \$50,000.

"Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, \$579,000.

"Capital Airport, Springfield, Illinois: Supply facilities, \$78,000.

"Des Moines Municipal Airport, Des Moines, Iowa: Operational and training facilities, \$53,000.

"Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,308,000.

"Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, New Hampshire: Operational and training facilities, \$170,000.

"Gulfport Municipal Airport, Gulfport, Mississippi: Supply facilities, \$302,000.

"Hayward Municipal Airport, Hayward, California: Operational and training facilities, \$113,000.

"Hensley Field, Grand Prairie, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,862,000.

"Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$159,000.

"Kellogg Field, Battle Creek, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,136,000.

"Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$570,000.

"Martinsburg Municipal Airport, Martinsburg, West Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$123,000.

"O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Operational and training facilities, \$1,099,000.

"Ontario International Airport, Ontario, California: Operational and training facilities, \$127,000.

"Portland Municipal Airport, Portland, Oregon: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, \$233,000.

"Rosecrans Field, Saint Joseph, Missouri: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$123,000.

"San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Supply facilities, \$70,000.

"Sky Harbor Airport, Phoenix, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, \$655,000.

"Standiford Field, Louisville, Kentucky: Operational and training facilities, and administrative facilities, \$715,000.

"Theodore F. Green Airport, Providence, Rhode Island: Operational and training facilities, \$213,000.

"Travis Field, Savannah, Georgia: Housing, supply facilities and utilities, \$317,000.

"Various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, \$300,000.

"(3) For Department of the Army:

"Army Reserve

"Batavia, New York: Training facilities, \$171,000.

"Beckley, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$289,000.

"Beloit, Wisconsin: Training facilities, \$157,000.

"Canandaigua, New York: Training facilities, \$171,000.

"Canton, Ohio: Training facilities, \$40,000.

"Cheyenne, Wyoming: Training facilities, \$149,000.

"Durant, Oklahoma: Training facilities, \$141,000.

"Fargo, North Dakota: Training facilities, \$149,000.

"Fremont, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.

"Galesburg, Illinois: Training facilities, \$157,000.

"Greenwood, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$85,000.

"Hempstead, New York (Nr2): Training facilities, \$536,000.

"Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$99,000.

"Kewaunee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, \$157,000.

"Madison, Wisconsin (Nr2): Training facilities, \$490,000.

"Oklahoma City, Oklahoma (Nr2): Training facilities, \$443,000.

"Saint Marys, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.

"Saint Marys, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$149,000.

"Salinas, California: Training facilities, \$164,000.

"Sinton, Texas: Training facilities, \$134,000.

"Stockton, California: Training facilities, \$164,000.

"Warren, Ohio: Training facilities, \$289,000.

"Weirton, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$149,000.

"San Jose, California: Road improvements, \$32,000.

"Land acquisition: Training facilities, \$419,000.

"Army National Guard of the United States

"(Armor)

"Ackerman, Mississippi: Training facilities, \$54,000.

"Agawam, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$210,000.

"Amarillo, Texas: Training facilities, \$231,000.

"Asheville, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$132,000.

"Ashford, Alabama: Training facilities, \$70,000.

"Atlanta, Georgia: Training facilities, \$132,000.

"Batesburg, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.

"Batesville, Mississippi: Training facilities, \$54,000.

"Beckley, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$200,000.

"Belfast, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.

"Belmont, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.

"Belton, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$122,000.

"Belton, Texas: Training facilities, \$86,000.

"Berryville, Arkansas: Training facilities, \$45,000.

"Berryville, Virginia: Training facilities, \$135,000.

"Bethel, Alaska: Training facilities, \$480,000.

"Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$45,000.

"Boston, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$270,000.

"Bridgeport, Alabama: Training facilities, \$70,000.

"Brunswick, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.

"Caldwell, Ohio: Training facilities, \$135,000.

"Calhoun, Georgia: Training facilities, \$110,000.

"Camden, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.

"Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$45,000.

"Catskill, New York: Training facilities, \$300,000.

"Chesterfield, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.

"Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$206,000.

"Cincinnati, Ohio: Training facilities, \$300,000.

"Clarksburg, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$189,000.

"Clayton, New Mexico: Training facilities, \$57,000.

"Clover, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.

"Cody, Wyoming: Training facilities, \$142,000.

"Concord, New Hampshire: Training facilities, \$375,000.

"Crossville, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.

"Cuero, Texas: Training facilities, \$93,000.

"Culver City, California: Training facilities, \$38,000.

"Dallas Number 5, Texas: Training facilities, \$154,000.

"Dayton, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.

"Duluth, Minnesota: Training facilities, \$37,000.

"Eatonton, Georgia: Training facilities, \$90,000.

"Edna, Texas: Training facilities, \$93,000.

"El Campo, Texas: Training facilities, \$104,000.

"Espanola, New Mexico: Training facilities, \$57,000.

"Fairbanks, Alaska: Training facilities, \$277,000.

"Farmville, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.

"Fontana, California: Training facilities, \$105,000.

"Franklin, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.

"Fredericktown, Missouri: Training facilities, \$135,000.

"Gainesville, Florida: Training facilities, \$120,000.

"Gainesville, Texas: Training facilities, \$111,000.

"Gardiner, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.

"Gassaway, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$189,000.

"Greensboro, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$357,000.
 "Greenville, Ohio: Training facilities, \$165,000.
 "Hammonton, New Jersey: Training facilities, \$175,000.
 "Harriman, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 "Hendersonville, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$120,000.
 "Hollister, California: Training facilities, \$105,000.
 "Honey Grove, Texas: Training facilities, \$90,000.
 "Houston Number 1, Texas: Training facilities, \$323,000.
 "Houston Number 2, Texas: Training facilities, \$264,000.
 "Jerome, Idaho: Training facilities, \$52,000.
 "Johnston, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
 "Juncos, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, \$38,000.
 "Juneau, Alaska: Training facilities, \$450,000.
 "Kannapolis, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$109,000.
 "Kealahou, Hawaii: Training facilities, \$145,000.
 "Ketchikan, Alaska: Training facilities, \$277,000.
 "Keyser, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$157,000.
 "Kingsport, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$165,000.
 "Lake City, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
 "Lasker-Woodland, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$103,000.
 "Laurinburg, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$105,000.
 "Lincolnton, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$95,000.
 "Ligonier, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$45,000.
 "Little Rock, Arkansas: Training facilities, \$260,000.
 "Livingston, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 "Logan, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$189,000.
 "Lovell, Wyoming: Training facilities, \$142,000.
 "Marietta, Georgia: Training facilities, \$90,000.
 "Mayaguez, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, \$160,000.
 "Middleboro, Kentucky: Training facilities, \$130,000.
 "Millinocket, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.
 "Minneapolis, Minnesota: Training facilities, \$88,000.
 "Nashville, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.
 "New Bern, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 "New London, Connecticut: Training facilities, \$360,000.
 "Norfolk, Virginia: Training facilities, \$441,000.
 "Northwest St. Paul, Minnesota: Training facilities, \$130,000.
 "Oak Ridge, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$142,000.
 "Ocean Springs, Mississippi: Training facilities, \$54,000.
 "Pacolet Mills, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
 "Patchogue, New York: Training facilities, \$375,000.
 "Persons, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 "Phoenix, Arizona: Training facilities, \$65,000.
 "Pitman, New Jersey: Training facilities, \$175,000.
 "Portland, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.

"Preston, Idaho: Training facilities, \$57,000.
 "Princeton, New Jersey: Training facilities, \$175,000.
 "Pulaski, Virginia: Training facilities, \$135,000.
 "Quitman, Georgia: Training facilities, \$90,000.
 "Reynolds, Georgia: Training facilities, \$90,000.
 "Richmond, Virginia: Training facilities, \$441,000.
 "Rigby, Idaho: Training facilities, \$57,000.
 "Rockingham, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.
 "Roseboro, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.
 "Saco, Maine: \$150,000.
 "Salem, New Jersey: Training facilities, \$15,000.
 "Salem, Oregon: Training facilities, \$161,000.
 "Salem, South Dakota: Training facilities, \$150,000.
 "San Fernando, California: Training facilities, \$115,000.
 "San Rafael (Fairfax), California: Training facilities, \$115,000.
 "Saranac Lake, New York: Training facilities, \$300,000.
 "Saugus, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$210,000.
 "Shallotte, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$95,000.
 "Silver City, New Mexico: Training facilities, \$57,000.
 "Sitka, Alaska: Training facilities, \$45,000.
 "Smithfield, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.
 "Smithtown, New York: Training facilities, \$300,000.
 "Socorro, New Mexico: Training facilities, \$57,000.
 "South Boston, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$360,000.
 "South Pittsburg, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 "South Portland, Maine: Training facilities, \$150,000.
 "Saint George, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
 "Stillwater, Minnesota: Training facilities, \$37,000.
 "Storm Lake, Iowa: Training facilities, \$95,000.
 "Sturgis, Michigan: Training facilities, \$220,000.
 "Swanton, Vermont: Training facilities, \$137,000.
 "Tell City, Indiana: Training facilities, \$188,000.
 "Texarkana, Texas: Training facilities, \$153,000.
 "Twin Falls, Idaho: Training facilities, \$90,000.
 "Valparaiso, Indiana: Training facilities, \$188,000.
 "Ventura, California: Training facilities, \$115,000.
 "Wahoo, Nebraska: Training facilities, \$115,000.
 "Wallace, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$95,000.
 "Waverly, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 "Waynesboro, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 "Weston, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$189,000.
 "Whitman, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$210,000.
 "Whitmire, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
 "Winnemucca, Nevada: Training facilities, \$110,000.
 "Yates Center, Kansas: Training facilities, \$93,000.
 "Yuma, Arizona: Training facilities, \$45,000.

"Army National Guard of the United States
 "(Nonarmory)

"Anchorage, Alaska: Administrative and supply facilities, \$192,000.
 "Augusta, Maine: Administrative and supply facilities, \$190,000.
 "Burlington, Vermont: Administrative and supply facilities, \$208,000.
 "Camp Beauregard, Louisiana: Administrative and supply facilities, \$325,000.
 "Camp Beauregard, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities, \$279,000.
 "Camp Butler, North Carolina: Supply facilities, \$353,000.
 "Camp Dodge, Iowa: Maintenance facilities, \$80,000.
 "Camp Dodge, Iowa: Supply facilities, \$120,000.
 "Camp Shelby, Mississippi: Maintenance facilities, \$165,000.
 "Columbia, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, \$80,000.
 "Concord, New Hampshire: Administrative and supply facilities, \$145,000.
 "Culbertson, Montana: Maintenance facilities, \$73,000.
 "Jefferson City, Missouri: Administrative and supply facilities, \$113,000.
 "Kalispell, Montana: Maintenance facilities, \$67,000.
 "Nashville, Tennessee: Administrative and supply facilities, \$493,000.
 "Salt Lake City, Utah: Maintenance facilities, \$235,000.
 "Trenton, New Jersey: Supply facilities, \$80,000.

"(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection.

"SEC. 604. The first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, does not apply to—

"(a) facilities that—

"(1) have been the subject of consultation with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives before July 1, 1958;

"(2) are under contract before July 1, 1960; and

"(3) are funded from appropriations made before the date of enactment of this Act; or
 "(b) facilities that are authorized by section 603 (4) of this Act; or

"(c) The following facilities for the Air National Guard of the United States:

"(1) Milford Point, Connecticut: Operational and training facilities, \$337,000.

"(2) Wellesley, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, \$319,000.

"(3) Westchester County Airport, White Plains, New York: Operational and training facilities, \$105,000.

"SEC. 605. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and section 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land in-

cludes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

"SEC. 606. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 603 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed—

"(1) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$11,886,000.

"(2) for Department of the Air Force:

"(a) Air Force Reserve, \$5,054,000;

"(b) Air National Guard of the United States, \$11,976,000.

"(3) for Department of the Army: Army Reserve and Army National Guard of the United States, \$28,330,000.

"SEC. 607. (a) Any of the amounts named in section 603 of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses 1, 2 (a), 2 (b), and 3 of section 606 respectively.

"(b) The Secretary of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, establish or develop facilities for Reserve forces other than those facilities authorized by section 603 of this Act, except that (1) the total cost of such facilities by any service shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total amount authorized to be expended by that service for projects under such section, and (2) the total cost for all projects established or developed by any service under the authority of this subsection shall not, when added to the total cost of the projects established or developed by such service under the authority of section 603, exceed the amounts prescribed by clauses 1, 2 (a), 2 (b), 3, of section 606, respectively.

"SEC. 608. This title may be cited as the 'Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1958'."

And the Senate agreed to the same.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
LEON H. GAVIN,
BOB WILSON,
KATHERINE ST. GEORGE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN STENNIS,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

On July 10, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 13015, which was the fiscal year 1959 military construction and authorization for the three military departments and the Department of Defense. For the first time, the bill also contains authority for Reserve component construction.

The larger differences and the action agreed upon by the conferees are as follows:

TITLE I

Army

In the Army title of the bill, the following items were in disagreement: The deletion by the Senate of hospitals at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., and Fort McClellan, Ala.; the deletion of a real-estate acquisition at Baywood Park, Calif.; the elimination of authority for construction of troop housing at Camp Desert Rock, Nev., and the elimination of Capehart housing units at Fort Bragg, N. C., and Fort Eustis, Va.

More importantly, the House and Senate versions of the bill were in disagreement with

respect to the removal from the Army title of approximately \$137 million representing construction for defense missiles and the placement of that authority in title IV of the bill under the Secretary of Defense.

Another area of disagreement involved the raising of the House figure of \$10 million to \$25 million for authority to construct facilities made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons development, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules.

Section 109 of the "Army" title relative to the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Houston, Tex., was a further item in disagreement.

Under the wording in the House version of the bill, it was mandatory that this depot be moved from its present location to the Point-Aux-Pins area, Alabama. The Senate varied the House version of this section in a number of respects. The most important change made by the Senate was to require that the depot be moved from Houston, Tex., "unless the Secretary of Defense finds after due investigation that such action would be inimical to the national security."

The House and Senate conferees resolved these differences as follows:

The Senate receded with respect to the provision of hospitals at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., and Fort McClellan, Ala.

The House receded with respect to the acquisition of real estate at Baywood Park, Calif., and also with respect to the provision of troop housing at Camp Desert Rock, Nev. The House further receded with respect to the provision of Capehart housing at Fort Bragg, N. C., and Fort Eustis, Va.

The difference between the Senate and House versions of the bill with respect to defense missiles was resolved to the satisfaction of all conferees by the deletion of section 402 of the bill as it appeared in the Senate version and inserting in lieu thereof a section 402, which renders entirely clear that the Secretary of Defense must make a decision with respect to the type of missile which is to be used and grants the Secretary of Defense authority to transfer funds between the Army and the Air Force in consonance with his decision.

With respect to San Jacinto, the House accepted the Senate version with an amendment. This amendment will require that should the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot be turned over to the General Services Administration for disposal, the requirement that the Department of the Army come into agreement with the Senate and House Armed Services Committees in accordance with existing law, will still obtain. The only other change made in this section was to require that if the Secretary of Defense determines that the depot should be moved, it be moved in 24 months rather than the 36 months set out in the Senate version of the bill.

In this connection, the conferees wish to draw attention to that portion of the Senate committee report relating to San Jacinto and other facilities of a similar nature. It is realized that ammunition storage and out-loading facilities create hazards in the area surrounding them, and it is felt that all these installations should receive close study to ascertain whether they should remain in their present locations. The Senate conferees made particular note of the facility at Fort Chicago being in this category and pointed out that the reason why the Senate committee has not taken action with respect to the movement of this installation is the fact that the Department of Defense indicates that its existence at its present location is essential to national security and that no satisfactory alternate site has been found on the Pacific coast.

As stated above, the House version of the bill contained an authority in the amount of \$10 million to be used to construct facilities made necessary by changes in Army mis-

sions, etc. The Senate version on the other hand contained authority in the amount of \$25 million for this purpose. The House and Senate conferees resolved this difference by setting a sum of \$17,500,000 as an amount adequate to cover the contingencies contemplated by this portion of the bill.

TITLE II

Navy

The only major areas of disagreement in the Navy title of the bill were the granting of authority for the construction of a drydock at the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, S. C.; the addition by the Senate of a Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Ariz.; the deletion by the Senate of a classified facility in section 202; the raising from \$10 million to \$25 million authority relating to changes in Navy missions, etc., as is described above with respect to a similar authority for the Army; and authority to construct 1,000 units of Capehart housing at the Naval Base, San Diego, Calif., together with the transfer of certain land necessary for this housing.

These changes were resolved as follows:

The House receded with respect to the drydock at Charleston, S. C., with an amendment. The amendment contemplates that authority in the amount of \$500,000 will be provided for necessary design, plans, and other necessary work preliminary to the initiation of construction of this important facility. It is the intention of the conferees that this authority be available for the removal and/or relocation of any structures in the area in which the construction is contemplated. The insertion by the Senate of the authority for the Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Ariz., was agreed to by the House conferees with an amendment providing for the acquisition of the necessary real estate. The Senate receded with respect to the authority which appeared in the House version of the bill for a classified facility in section 202. Another classified facility in an amount approximating \$1,200,000 was removed from this section at the insistence of the House conferees.

Again, the compromise figure of \$17,500,000 was accepted by the conferees for construction made necessary in Navy missions, new weapons development, etc., as was reached with respect to the Army, above.

The Senate receded with respect to the 1,000 units of Capehart housing at the Navy Base, San Diego, Calif., and a minor adjustment was made with respect to the land necessary for this housing. The Senate had added Wherry acquisitions at Camp Pendleton, Calif., Twentynine Palms, Calif., and at Squantum Gardens, Mass. The House receded with respect to these three additions.

TITLE III

Air Force

There were few areas of disagreement in the Air Force title of the bill. These were the provision of facilities at Lowry Air Force Base, Colo., which the House allowed but the Senate deleted. The Senate had inserted authority for construction at Moody Air Force Base, Ga. The House version of the bill had no similar item. Also, the House had provided authority for troop housing construction at Barksdale Air Force Base, La., which item was deleted by the Senate. The Senate had also deleted commissaries at Castle Air Force Base, Calif., Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak., and Westover Air Force Base, Mass., and a railway facility at Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, N. C. The Senate also had inserted a classified facility under the Aircraft Control and Warning System portion of the bill.

A further difference involved the question of defense missiles as such is dealt with in section 302 of the bill. The only other difference between the House and Senate version in the Air Force title related to the question of the proper sum for authority

for construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, etc. This matter is dealt with with respect to section 102 under the Army title of the bill. The same solution of the difference was arrived at by the provision of \$17,500,000, as in titles I and II.

The other differences between the House and Senate versions were resolved as follows:

The House receded with respect to Lowry Air Force Base primarily on the basis that the Air Force could no longer defend this item in any specific fashion since the location of the facility still awaits decisions within the Department of Defense.

The insertion by the Senate of facilities for Moody Air Force Base was accepted by the House conferees with an amendment. The amendment added appropriate authority for troop housing and utilities at this installation. The troop housing at Barksdale Air Force Base, which had been deleted by the Senate, was reinserted by the conferees with the Senate receding. The House receded with respect to the three commissaries mentioned above. The classified facility under the Aircraft Control and Warning System was permitted to remain in the bill with the House receding.

Section 302 of the bill contains authority similar to that contained in section 102 under the "Army" title. The solution arrived at with respect to this section is identical with that for the similar Army authority. This item is dealt with in some greater detail below.

TITLE IV

Secretary of Defense

Under title IV, the Senate had inserted language which appeared to place operational authority in the Secretary of Defense with respect to defense missiles. As indicated under both the Army and Air Force portions of this statement, a new section was inserted in lieu of section 402 of the Senate version of the bill.

All conferees felt that the function of this new section and the purposes which it is designed to accomplish could best be described by setting out the exact language of this important change in the bill. This new language clarifies the original intent not to make authorizations or appropriations in operational matters directly to the Secretary of Defense.

"SEC. 402. The Secretary of Defense or his designee shall, prior to the utilization of the funds authorized by sections 102 and 302 of this Act for establishing or developing classified installations and facilities for defense missiles by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force, respectively, determine with respect to each defended area, which missile or combination of missiles will be employed in that area. In making such determination, the Secretary of Defense shall have the authority to transfer such funds as may be made available pursuant to the authorization contained in such sections for such installations and facilities, to the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, to enable such Secretaries to utilize the authority contained in such sections in accordance with such determinations."

TITLE V

General provisions

The areas of disagreement under title V were not numerous but did involve matters of considerable importance.

The first item of disagreement related to section 506 of the Senate version of the bill relating to contracts entered into by the United States. The House and Senate conferees both had exactly the same purpose in mind and that was to insure that to the maximum extent possible, construction contracts within the Department of Defense shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of

Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy. The House conferees felt that the Senate language permitted a latitude which might fail to achieve the end sought and the Senate receded by accepting a new version of the language appearing at the first part of section 506. The new language agreed upon by the conferees is as follows:

"Sec. 506. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States, its Territories and possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency."

The conferees wish to stress the importance of this portion of the bill since it is their firm belief that the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Yards and Docks are fully qualified by long experience in the administration of construction contracts and should, therefore, be fully utilized. It will be noted that the use of any other department or Government agency for the supervision of such contracts is limited to those instances where their jurisdiction and supervision by the Corps or the Bureau are wholly impracticable.

The next area of disagreement related to the exception from the repealer language of the backup authorization for rental guaranty housing. The Senate had deleted this item from the bill, but receded.

Section 512 of the bill had no counterpart in the House version. It is designed to permit all Wherry housing, whether mandatory or permissive, to be acquired by the military departments without the need for a line item in the annual construction bill.

Section 513, which also had no counterpart in the House version, limits the number of surplus commodity houses to 4,000 units for fiscal year 1959, and Capehart houses to 30,000 units for the same period. The House conferees made certain modifications to the Senate language which were acceptable to the Senate conferees. The principal change was the substitution for the word "constructed" of the words "contracted for." This will permit more orderly administration of the law and will express in better terms the actual intention of the Senate.

Subsection (d) of this section sets out the procedure which will be followed in the condemnation of Wherry housing projects. In great part, this subsection repeats existing law. It did, however, embody certain important differences from existing law, principally the mandatory requirement that the issue of just compensation for a Wherry project be determined by a commission of three persons to be appointed by the court. The Senate language, as stated above, required that compensation be determined by commissioners. Normal practice contemplates that the court exercise discretion as to whether commissioners shall be appointed or the matter of compensation be determined by a jury. The Senate conferees determined that their language should be made permissive rather than mandatory and as this is a privileged motion, the Senate changed its language from mandatory to permissive. Subsection (d) (2) was stricken from the bill in view of the fact that the Senate's change of the word "shall" to the word "may" made this particular subsection unnecessary.

Section 516 of the Senate version extended until 1962 the period within which substandard family housing must be rehabilitated, converted to other use, or destroyed. The House conferees felt that this extension would tend to perpetuate a situation which everyone is agreed should be terminated at the very earliest possible date. The House

conferees agreed, however, to a 1-year extension, until 1961, but wish to stress their strong interest in the prompt reconversion or destruction of substandard housing.

TITLE VI

Reserve forces facilities

The Senate amendment contained a provision authorizing the Secretaries of the military services with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to establish or develop Reserve facilities other than those authorized by section 603 providing that the total cost of such facilities by any service would not exceed 10 percent of the total amount authorized to be expended by that service and would not exceed the total amount authorized for such service.

The Senate amendment provides a flexibility for the military services which appears to be necessary. This is particularly true in that the bill is the first wherein reserve facility construction has been authorized by line item instead of by general authorizations as has been done in the past.

In addition, it will allow minor deviations from the line items contained in the bill in the event State or Federal authorities find that a project is needed prior to the submission of the next annual military construction bill.

The House recedes.

The House bill contained authorization for 35 National Guard armories at a cost of \$5,007,000. The Senate amendment added 108 armories at an additional cost of \$15,093,000.

The managers on the part of the House concurred with the Senate in that additional guard armories are needed. Furthermore, the States have appropriated and made available as matching funds \$35 million which cannot be used until the Federal Government contributes its share.

At the present time the National Guard Bureau estimates that more than 700 guard armories are still needed throughout the country. In view of this shortage it was believed that guard facilities in excess of those contained in the House bill should be authorized.

The House recedes.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
LEON C. GAVIN,
BOB WILSON,
KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

MISS BERTHA ADKINS

(Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, on my return from a very brief visit to Brazil to attend the Interparliamentary Union Conference, I heard with great pleasure that the President had named my very good and dear friend, Miss Bertha Adkins, to the position of Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This is a most felicitous choice. It is high time that a woman of talent and capability be a member of the Cabinet.

Miss Adkins is admirably fitted through her experience in the field of education, her gift for getting on with people, her calm poise and serene outlook to fill this position as it should be filled, and the women of America will be able to take pride in the recognition given to one

of their sex, not because she is a woman but because she is far and away the best person for the job.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 139 I was incorrectly listed as absent. I was present in the Chamber and answered to my name when it was called. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal may be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the permanent RECORD and the Journal will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

A GRISLY CALL FOR ACTION ON THE KENNEDY-IVES BILL

(Mr. UDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the human-torch burning of Teamster Agent Frank Kierdorf, in Pontiac, Mich., yesterday was a grisly and unanswerable argument for immediate enactment of the Kennedy-Ives labor-reform bill.

This incident was the logical result of an ex-convict occupying a position of leadership in a racket-ridden union. There is little wonder that Mr. Hoffa and his ilk are strenuously opposed to the Kennedy-Ives labor-reform bill.

The attack victim, Frank Kierdorf, could never have become a union official had the Kennedy-Ives bill been in force.

The Kierdorf burning is a gruesome call for action by the House before Congress adjourns on the Kennedy-Ives bill.

INCREASING THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 671, Rept. No. 2429), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13580) to increase the public debt limit, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 8742) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide a 2-year statute of limitations on actions involving transportation of property and passengers of the United States Government and to provide that deductions for overcharges by the United States shall be made within 3 years from time of payment, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Amend section 16 (3) as follows: In subparagraph (a), strike out "2 years" and insert "3 years"; in subparagraph (c) strike out "2 years" and insert "3 years", and strike out "2-year" and insert "3-year"; and in subparagraph (d) strike out the word "2-year" the second time it occurs and insert "3-year."

(2) Add the following new subparagraph (i) to section 16.(3):

"(i) The provisions of this paragraph (3) shall extend to and embrace all transportation of property or passengers for or on behalf of the United States in connection with any action brought before the Commission or any court by or against carriers subject to this part: *Provided, however*, That with respect to such transportation of property or passengers for or on behalf of the United States, the periods of limitation herein provided shall be extended to include 3 years from the date of (A) payment of charges for the transportation involved, or (B) subsequent refund for overpayment of such charges, or (C) deduction made under section 322 of the Transportation Act of 1940 (49 U. S. C. 66), whichever is later."

(3) Amend section 204a as follows: In paragraph (1) strike out "2 years" and insert "3 years"; in paragraph (2) strike out "2 years" and insert "3 years", and strike out "2-year" and insert "3-year"; and in paragraph (3) strike out "2-year" and insert "3-year."

(4) Add the following new paragraph (7) to section 204a:

"(7) The provisions of this section 204a shall extend to and embrace all transportation of property or passengers for or on behalf of the United States in connection with any action brought before any court by or against carriers subject to this part: *Provided, however*, That with respect to such transportation of property or passengers for or on behalf of the United States, the periods of limitation herein provided shall be extended to include 3 years from the date of (A) payment of charges for the transportation involved, or (B) subsequent refund for overpayment of such charges, or (C) deduction made under section 322 of the Transportation Act of 1940 (49 U. S. C. 66), whichever is later."

(5) Amend section 308 (f) (1) as follows: In subparagraph (A) strike out "2 years" and insert "3 years"; in subparagraph (C) strike out "2 years" and insert "3 years", and strike out "2-year" and insert "3-year"; and in subparagraph (D) strike out the word "2-year" the second time it occurs and insert "3-year."

(6) Add the following new subparagraph (5) to section 308 (f):

"(5) The provisions of this paragraph (f) shall extend to and embrace all transportation of property or passengers for or on behalf of the United States in connection with any action brought before the Commission or any court by or against carriers subject to this part: *Provided, however*, That with

respect to such transportation of property or passengers for or on behalf of the United States, the periods of limitation herein provided shall be extended to include 3 years from the date of (A) payment of charges for the transportation involved, or (B) subsequent refund for overpayment of such charges, or (C) deduction made under section 322 of the Transportation Act of 1940 (49 U. S. C. 66), whichever is later."

(7) Amend section 406a as follows: In paragraph (1) strike out "2 years" and insert "3 years"; in paragraph (2) strike out "2 years" and insert "3 years", and strike out "2-year" and insert "3-year"; and in paragraph (3) strike out "2-year" and insert "3-year."

(8) Add the following new paragraph (7) to section 406a:

"(7) The provisions of this section 406a shall extend to and embrace all transportation of property for or on behalf of the United States in connection with any action brought before any court by or against carriers subject to this part: *Provided, however*, That with respect to such transportation of property for or on behalf of the United States, the periods of limitation herein provided shall be extended to include 3 years from the date of (A) payment of charges for the transportation involved, or (B) subsequent refund for overpayment of such charges, or (C) deduction made under section 322 of the Transportation Act of 1940 (49 U. S. C. 66), whichever is later."

Sec. 2. Section 322 of the Transportation Act of 1940, (49 U. S. C. 66) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking the words "overpayment to" and substituting therefor the words "overcharges by."

(2) By adding a new sentence at the end of the section as follows: "The term 'overcharges' shall be deemed to mean charges for transportation services in excess of those applicable thereto under the tariffs lawfully on file with the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board and charges in excess of those applicable thereto under rates, fare, and charges established pursuant to section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act: *Provided, however*, That such deductions shall be made within 3 years (not including any time of war) from the time of payment of bills: *Provided further*, That every claim cognizable by the General Accounting Office for charges for transportation within the purview of this section shall be forever barred unless such claim shall be received in the General Accounting Office within 3 years (not including any time of war) from the date of (1) accrual of the cause of action thereon, or (2) payment of charges for the transportation involved, or (3) subsequent refund for overpayment of such charges, or (4) deduction made pursuant to this section, whichever is later."

Sec. 3. The provisions of this act which amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, shall apply only to causes of action which accrue on or after the effective date of this act. The provision of this act which amends section 322 of the Transportation Act of 1940 (49 U. S. C. 66) shall apply only to transportation performed and payment made therefor subsequent to the effective date of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 8742 has a committee amendment which strikes out all after the enacting clause and inserts the committee draft of the

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued August 7, 1958

For actions of August 6, 1958

85th-2d, No. 134

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Accounting.....	23,40	
Appropriations.....	7	
Atomic energy.....	10	
Budgeting.....	5,40	
Cornmeal.....	25	
Defense production.....	25	
Economic situation.....	28	
Education.....	9	
Electrification.....	2,26	
Fair trade.....	31	
Farm committeemen.....	25	
Farm loans.....	40	
Farm program.....	1,27	
Federal-State relations.....	22	
Feed.....	1	
Flour.....	25	
Foreign trade.....	3,19	
Fruits and nuts.....	6	
Imports.....	6	
Inspection services.....	13	
Legislative program.....	18,25	
Livestock.....	1	
Meatpackers.....	37	
Military construction.....	8	
Minerals.....	16,24	
Organization.....	2	
Personnel.....	11,39	
Price control.....	38	
Property.....	12	
Public debt.....	4,32	
Public Law 480.....	19	
Reports.....	14	
Research.....	14	
Small business.....	17	
Soil conservation.....	34	
Statehood.....	15,30	
Surplus commodities.....	19	
Surplus property.....	21	
Tobacco.....	20	
Trade agreements.....	29	
Water.....	33,35	
Wheat.....	25	
Wool.....	36	

HIGHLIGHTS: House rejected farm bill. House passed bill to increase public debt limit. House received conference report on trade agreements extension bill. House Rules Committee reported resolution to agree to Senate amendments to accrued expenditures budgeting bill. House committee ordered reported bill to grant REA Administrator more authority. Sen. Humphrey urged long-term extension of Public Law 480. Sen. Ellender introduced bill to provide revolving fund for USDA loans.

HOUSE

- FARM PROGRAM.** Voted, 210 to 186, to suspend the rules and pass S. 4071, the farm bill. Since this was not the required two-thirds vote for passage under suspension of the rules, the bill was rejected. p. 15049
Rep. Anderson stated that food prices are increasing and that he has "predicted time and again consumers do not benefit from legislation and administrative action to depress farm commodity prices." p. 15044
Rep. Harvey discussed the farm situation, particularly with regard to feed and livestock, and urged enactment of legislation for increased research on the industrial utilization of farm products. pp. 15085-89
- ELECTRIFICATION; ORGANIZATION.** The Government Operations Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 11762, to provide that Sec. I of the Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, giving the Secretary administrative control over all USDA agencies, shall not hereafter apply to REA. p. D305

House - Aug 6, 1958

3. FOREIGN TRADE. Received the conference report on H. R. 12591, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements (H. Rept. 2502). As reported the bill, among other things, extends the President's authority to enter into trade agreements for 4 years; restores a House provision that action found and reported by the Tariff Commission in an escape-clause proceeding to be necessary to prevent or remedy serious injury is to take effect if approved by the President or, if disapproved by the President; upon the adoption by both Houses of a concurrent resolution stating that the House and Senate approve the action so found and reported by the Tariff Commission to be necessary; and deletes a Senate amendment providing for the establishment of a bipartisan commission, the Commission on International Trade Agreement Policy, to study and recommend improvements in international trade agreement policies. pp. 15083-85-, 15115
4. PUBLIC DEBT. Passed without amendment, 286 to 108, H. R. 13580, to increase the public debt limit to \$285 billion. pp. 15048-49
5. BUDGETING. The Rules Committee reported a resolution to agree to the Senate amendments to H. R. 8002, the accrued expenditures budgeting bill. pp. 15049-50, 15114
6. FRUIT AND NUT IMPORTS. Voted, 136 to 109, to suspend the rules and pass H. R. 11056, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act so as to extend restrictions on certain imported citrus fruits, dried fruits, walnuts, and dates. Since this was not the required two-thirds vote for passage under suspension of the rules, the bill was rejected. p. 15050
7. APPROPRIATIONS. Received the conference report on H. R. 12738, the Defense Department appropriation bill for 1959 (H. Rept. 2503). pp. 15081-83
8. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Agreed, 256 to 135, to the conference report on H. R. 13015, the military construction authorization bill. pp. 15044-48
9. EDUCATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 13247, to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical needs. (pp. 15050, 15114) Rep. Dwyer spoke on the need for enactment of this legislation. (pp. 15106-07)
10. ATOMIC ENERGY. Rep. Holifield criticized the President's statement taking exception to certain provisions of the atomic energy authorization bill, including the development of certain power reactors. pp. 15103-106
11. PERSONNEL. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment S. 1903, to authorize the payment of transportation expenses for Presidential appointees assigned to duty posts outside the continental U. S. (H. Rept. 2487). p. 15115
The Ways and Means Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11098, to repeal Section 1505 of the Social Security Act to provide that in determining eligibility of Federal employees for unemployment compensation their accrued annual leave shall be treated in accordance with State laws. p. D807
12. PROPERTY. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment H. R. 13673, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer fire-fighting organizations (H. Rept. 2494). p. 15115

ment of the House numbered 2 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment, strike out "Sec. 602. Transfer of funds" and insert "Sec. 602. Fund for management counseling"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"(3) the terms 'small-business investment company' and 'company' mean a small-business investment company organized as provided in title III, including (except for purposes of section 301 and section 308 (f)) a State-chartered investment company which has obtained the approval of the Administrator to operate under the provisions of this Act as provided in section 309 and a company converted into a small-business investment company under section 401 of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 301. (a) Small business investment companies may be formed for the purpose of operating under this Act by any number of persons, not less than 10, who shall subscribe to the articles of incorporation of any such company: *Provided*, That no such company shall be chartered by the Administration under this section in any State unless the Administration determines that investment companies cannot be chartered under the laws of such State and operate in accordance with the purpose of this Act: *Provided further*, That no such company shall be chartered by the Administration under this section after June 30, 1961."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment, restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment, and on page 9, line 3, of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out "309 (f)" and insert "308 (f)"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment, and on page 20 of the Senate engrossed bill strike out the sentence beginning in line 12 and insert the following: "Such approval shall be given with due regard to the factors specified in section 301 (c) with respect to organization of small business investment companies."; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment, restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment, and on page 25, line 10, of the Senate engrossed bill strike out "section 207 (c) of the Small Business Act of 1953" and insert "section 7 (d) of the Small Business Act"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 39, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment, and (1) on page 25, line 14, of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out "Section 207 of the Small Business Act of 1953" and insert "Section 7 of the Small Business Act"; (2) on page 25, line 17, of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)"; (3) on page 25, line 21, of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out "agricultural" and insert "agriculture for"; (4) on page 25, line 25, of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out "subsection (b) (4) of this section" and insert "section 8 (b) (1)."

And the House agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
JACKSON E. BETTS,
GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
JOSEPH S. CLARK,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3651) to make equity capital and long-term credit more readily available for small-business concerns, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The following House amendments made technical, clerical, clarifying, or conforming changes: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 22, 27, 28, 33, 34, 35, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45. With respect to these amendments (1) the Senate either recedes or recedes with amendments which are technical, clerical, clarifying, or conforming in nature, or (2) the House recedes in order to conform to other action agreed upon by the committee of conference.

Amendments Nos. 4, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23, 24, 25, and 26: Title III of the Senate bill (and related provisions in other titles) authorizes the Small Business Administration, until June 30, 1961, to charter small business investment companies to provide equity capital and long-term loan funds to small-business concerns under the program established by the bill. State-chartered investment companies which meet certain of the standards and requirements applicable to Federally chartered companies under the bill, and State investment and development companies which are converted by their shareholders before July 1961 into small business investment companies in accordance with procedures and standards prescribed by the bill, could also operate as small business investment companies under the program. After June 1961 there would be no further Federal chartering of such companies or conversion of State companies (although companies so chartered or converted would continue to operate under the program), and the only new small business investment companies would be those chartered under State law expressly for the purpose of operating under the program.

These House amendments eliminated from the bill all provision for Federal chartering of small business investment companies and all provision for the conversion of State investment and development companies, thus providing that operations under the new program from its inception (except for the direct SBA loans to State and local de-

velopment companies authorized by both versions of the bill) will be carried on exclusively through investment companies chartered under State law expressly for the purpose of such operations. Substantially all of the standards, procedures and functions prescribed in the Senate bill with respect to the organization and operation of Federally-chartered companies would be made specifically applicable to these State-chartered companies, including the requirement that the articles of incorporation of any such company be presented to the Administrator for his approval before it can operate under the program and that such articles confer certain specified powers upon the company.

The Senate recedes on amendments Nos. 17 and 18, and recedes, with amendments, on amendments Nos. 4, 13, 15, and 25, and the House recedes on the remaining amendments. Under the action thus taken by the conferees, the Small Business Administration's authority for a 3-year period to issue Federal charters to small business investment companies (as provided in the Senate bill) is retained, but such authority is limited to States where investment companies cannot be chartered under State law and operate in accordance with the purpose of the act. State-chartered investment companies would not be compelled to meet the organizational requirements which are imposed with respect to federally chartered companies under both the Senate bill and the House amendments (and which are also applicable to State-chartered companies under the Senate bill), although in approving State-chartered companies to operate under the program the Administration would still take into account such factors as the need for small-business financing and the soundness of the company involved, and in their operations under the program such companies would be governed by regulations of the Administration. The authority in the Senate bill for State investment and development companies (during a 3-year period) to convert themselves into Federal small business investment companies is retained in the conference agreement.

This represents a compromise to protect the traditional powers of the States to charter business corporations, while at the same time permitting Federal chartering in situations where State laws are not compatible with effective operation of a State-chartered company under the new act. There are strong indications that this situation exists in some States; before issuing a Federal charter in such a State, the Small Business Administrator would have to make an affirmative determination that this is the case.

Amendment No. 6: Section 103 (a) (6) of the Senate bill (defining the term "investment companies") in effect required a State-chartered investment company to meet the definition contained in the Investment Company Act of 1940 in order to qualify for conversion into a small business investment company under title IV of the bill. The House amendment deleted this definition, in order to permit smaller, closely held companies to qualify for conversion. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 11: Section 202 of the Senate bill provided the sum of \$250 million for the new small business investment company program, making such sum available over a 3-year period through public debt transactions the proceeds of which would constitute a new and separate revolving fund and be used for purposes enumerated in section 203. The House amendment also provided the sum of \$250 million for the program; but it would make such sum available (through amendments to the Small Business Act, replacing both section 202 and section 203 of the Senate bill) by increasing the amount authorized to be appropriated

to the Administration's existing revolving fund, and earmarking the increased amount for the new program.

The Senate recedes, so that the bill agreed to in conference authorizes financing through appropriated funds rather than public debt transactions. In view of the fact that it has been argued recently that public debt financing could not be provided in this bill under the Constitution and the Rules of the House, the committee of conference wishes to emphasize that in agreeing to the House amendment on this point they do not in any way concede the validity of any such argument. The House Banking and Currency Committee agreed to strike the public debt transaction provisions for entirely different reasons, among them being the fact that the other SBA programs are financed through appropriations. Also, the Bureau of the Budget has already approved a request of \$50 million in appropriations for this new program, and the Senate Appropriations Committee is actively considering this request; the conference committee is confident that this sum will be made available. The acceptance of the House amendment should not, therefore, be taken as a precedent by those who would deny the long-recognized jurisdiction of the legislative committees of both Houses to include provisions for public debt transactions in bills they report.

Amendment No. 19: Section 302 (b) of the Senate bill authorized the purchase of small-business investment company stock by banks, financial institutions, insurance companies, corporations, partnerships, and other persons, limiting the aggregate amount of such stock which may be held by a Federal Reserve member bank or a bank insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to 1 percent of its capital and surplus. The House amendment restricted this stock-purchase authority to banks, and added new language to make it clear that the right of Federal Reserve member banks and FDIC-insured banks to purchase such stock up to 1 percent of their capital and surplus is subject (except in the case of national banks) to the provisions of applicable State law; the extent to which institutions other than banks could purchase such stock would, of course, continue to be governed by other applicable law. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 20: Section 304 (d) of the Senate bill, in requiring a small-business concern receiving capital under the bill to invest in the stock of the company furnishing the capital (in an amount equal to not less than 2 nor more than 5 percent of the capital so furnished), authorized the Administrator to permit such concern to postpone making its investment in such stock for a period of up to 3 years. The House amendment eliminated this authority to permit the postponement of the required investment. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 21: Section 305 of the Senate bill authorized long-term loans to small-business concerns by small-business investment companies; and subsection (b) of that section would permit such loans to be made either directly or on a participation basis. The House amendment added new language to subsection (b) limiting small-business investment company participation, where the participation is on a deferred basis, to 90 percent of the balance of the loan outstanding at the time of disbursement. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 29, 30, and 31: Section 501 of the Senate bill authorized the Administration to make loans to State and local development companies in exchange for their obligations, to assist in carrying out the purposes of the act, with a termination date for loans to local development companies of June 30, 1961. These House amendments eliminated all authority to make such loans to local development companies, thus restricting the program to State companies

(but retaining in other provisions of the bill the authority to make secured loans for plant construction or improvement to local as well as State development companies). The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 32: This amendment added to section 501. (b) of the Senate bill a new sentence requiring that unsecured loans made to development companies (under the program discussed in connection with amendments Nos. 29, 30, and 31) must be treated on an equal basis with funds of the highest priority borrowed by such companies from other sources after the enactment of the act, except when this requirement is waived by the Administrator. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 36, 38, and 39: Section 601 of the Senate bill repealed section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act (which authorizes working-capital loans to business concerns by Federal Reserve Banks), and section 602 of the Senate bill provided that amounts repaid to the United States by those banks as a result of such repeal shall be used to finance a new program of grants for studies, research, and counseling for small businesses under the Small Business Act. Under the program, grants would be limited to \$40,000, and not more than one grant could be made in any one State in any one year. These House amendments eliminated the new program and provided that amounts repaid as a result of the repeal of section 13b shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The conference agreement retains the provisions of the Senate bill, with technical amendments. The committee of conference felt that these grants will materially assist in filling the need for management counseling for small-business concerns. Lack of such counseling constitutes one of the most serious handicaps many small businesses face today.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
JACKSON E. BETTS,
GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

FARM LEGISLATION

(Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the rallying cry for votes against fair and equitable farm legislation which would help stabilize and support our farm economy has become a plea to reduce food prices for consumers. I know that food prices are high, but so are all the other retail prices in our present economy.

The classic example of this protect-the-consumer clamor was the opposition to the resolution earlier this year to freeze price supports, especially those for dairy products. It will also be recalled that Secretary Benson publicly promised retail price reductions on dairy products if he was permitted to reduce dairy price supports. As a matter of fact, he said that if retail prices did not go down the trade would hear from him.

For the information of our colleagues pleading for consumers, I quote the following facts and figures from the United States Department of Agriculture. The dairy price support reductions went into effect April 1, 1958—now let us see what has happened to consumer prices. From May 1957 to May 1958 retail prices on

butter went down only four-tenths of a cent, cheese went up six-tenths, fresh milk went up four-tenths, and evaporated milk went up six-tenths. In that same period the spread between producers and consumers went up 9 percent.

As I have predicted time and again consumers do not benefit from legislative and administrative action to depress farm commodity prices. The middlemen, processors, and food handlers take the difference and even add on a little more as I have pointed out. Consumers do not gain anything, and, as a matter of hard fact, they lose purchasing power for the goods and services they want to sell in the rural areas. I hope we have heard the last of this plea for consumers as a device to muster votes against necessary farm legislation. The statistics of our food economy prove that neither producers nor consumers gain anything, so why hurt the producers?

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 153 on August 4 I am recorded as being absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 5, 1958).

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important bills that has been considered by the House during this session.

When the bill passed the House, it authorized an expenditure of \$1,658,491,000. When the bill passed the Senate it authorized an expenditure of \$1,644,641,000. As a result of the conference between the House and the Senate, the bill now is \$21,616,000 less than the House version and \$6,766,000 less than the Senate version.

The Senate included 108 National Guard armories. This, therefore, makes a total Reserve program in the bill of 259 Reserve installations.

Mr. Speaker, there are only two matters in this conference report that I desire to discuss. One has reference to what is known as the condemnation of

Wherry housing projects. The House version on this bill has no language whatever relating to condemnation of Wherry housing since it was satisfied to permit the regular condemnation proceedings under existing laws to prevail. The bill, as it passed the Senate, required that when a Wherry housing project was condemned, the compensation that was to be paid to the owner should be determined by a commission. This was a mandatory provision and varied from the tradition law on this subject rather radically.

Mr. Speaker, under the fifth amendment and the court decisions which have followed from this provision, and also under the Rules of Federal Procedure, the question of just compensation has always been determined either through the appointment of Commissioners or the use of a jury. It has been discretionary with the court as to which of these courses should be followed. Under the Senate language, the right of a jury trial would have been eliminated and the court would have no choice but to appoint a commission. The Senate conferees decided that, perhaps, that was not a wise amendment to the bill and, therefore, receded and insisted that the mandatory language for the appointment of the commission be changed to permissive language which will allow either the use of a jury or the appointment of commissioners. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the net effect of this act is to place the law relative to the determination of just compensation where it was before, and the value will be determined as it always has been for any property acquired by the United States through condemnation proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is sufficient information to the House to clear up that point.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. RAINS. As I understood the distinguished gentleman, he stated that the only change in the language which the Senate had in its bill was that it was changed from "shall" to "may" with reference to that particular type of condemnation proceeding; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RAINS. There was no change, as I read the report, made in the so-called formula. It is the same as in the present law; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; as far as the Committee on Armed Services conferees are concerned—that is correct. In that connection, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, there is an important difference between the method of determining value for Wherry houses in the armed services construction bill and in the banking and currency bill which has passed the Senate. In our bill, we permit the determination of value to be done in the traditional fashion and without in any way conditioning the elements which a court may consider in arriving at just compensation. This is a tried and true method which has been used ever since the adop-

tion of the Constitution, and I see no reason to change it. In the banking, and currency bill, however, the court apparently will not be allowed to function as a free agent but, if I read your bill correctly, will be required to give special consideration to certain elements of value. These elements are always considered by the court, but they constitute only some of the elements in the whole process of value determination.

Mr. RAINS. If the gentleman will yield further, as I read the report, I do not see any difference in the formula that is in the Banking and Currency Committee bill that has been reported because it does not change the formula which has been in the law, both in the military construction bill and in the Banking and Currency Committee bill for the last 3 or 4 years. You did not change that law; did you?

Mr. VINSON. No. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that when the Committee on Banking and Currency submits its bill, I hope to be able to obtain the floor to point out what I consider to be the proper considerations in regard to the values in condemnation proceedings. I trust we will debate that at that time, if that is satisfactory to the gentleman.

Mr. RAINS. That is satisfactory, but I am unable to see where there is any difference, and I would be glad if the gentleman would state, if he can, what the difference is.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman's formula, as set out in the Banking and Currency Committee, is that the Commissioners shall take into consideration the replacement cost today, minus a depreciation. We think that should not be spelled out in that kind of language, because if you take that into consideration it is bound, in some instances, to increase the value of the property, and restricts the freedom of the court to determine value.

Mr. Speaker, I have one other point that I desire to call attention to, if the House will bear with me. I will not take long, and this is very important. The House will recall that in the public works bill there was a mandatory provision relating to what is known as the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Houston, Tex. That language made it mandatory that this ordnance facility in the vicinity of Houston, Tex., should be disposed of. The House language required the Secretary of the Army to dispose of it. The Senate version varies from the House language in the following manner. The Senate language says that the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to make the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot available to the Administrator of the General Services Administration for disposal, unless the Secretary of Defense finds that after due investigation such action would be inimical to the national security. Our House version is absolutely mandatory, but the Senate language is discretionary. The question of whether the depot will be moved is left to the determination of the Secretary of Defense, based upon whether it would be inimical to the national security. So I think the Senate language—and the House conferees—is

much preferable to this House version. Therefore we accepted the Senate language.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. It would have been much more preferable if it had been stricken out altogether.

Mr. VINSON. I differ with the distinguished gentleman, because I think the facts were not pointed out sufficiently. We just read in the papers of a great explosion that occurred in Brazil a few days ago at a similar installation.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I am sure we handle our explosives differently than the Brazilians.

Mr. VINSON. Well, we had a large explosion in Port Chicago. Over 300 people were killed.

Let me show you another safeguard we have here. We put a provision in this conference report, agreed to by the Senate, that whenever disposal is made of this property it must be cleared through the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate. So therefore the two committees will have to see that the Government receives a fair value for this property if the Secretary determines to move the facilities.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. If this proposition comes to the House Committee on Armed Services and there is any divergence of views, will the gentleman then bring it to the floor and let us decide it here?

Mr. VINSON. No. I think you can trust the House committee to see that not only in this instance but in every other instance the interest of the Government will be protected; that we get value for what we sell.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the conference report on the military construction bill marks the conclusion of legislation to be reported by the House Committee on Armed Services for the 85th Congress. So I think it would be appropriate at this time to give a brief summary of the committee's activities during this Congress.

During the second session the full committee has held 84 meetings, and the subcommittees have held 65 meetings, for a total of 149 meetings on legislative matters.

The committee and its subcommittees have considered in excess of 75 bills, of which 46 were reported to the House.

The Real Estate and Construction Subcommittee has considered and approved the following projects: 151 real estate projects, 1 of which covered 37 installations; 32 Capehart housing projects, involving 10,207 units; 56 housing projects involving 1,643 units to be constructed by appropriated funds; 19 Wherry acquisition projects, including

15,339 units; 6 surplus commodity housing projects, including 1,784 units.

The Subcommittee for Special Investigations has conducted 8 public hearings and 19 executive hearings, and has processed 76 inquiries from congressional offices.

From January 15, 1957, until this date there have been 140 meetings of the full committee, 151 meetings of the subcommittees, and 74 meetings of the Subcommittee for Special Investigations, for a total of 365 meetings on legislative and investigative activities of the committee during the 85th Congress.

More than 175 bills and resolutions were considered during this Congress. The committee reported 109 bills and resolutions, and 106 of these have passed the House.

In addition to these legislative and investigative actions of the committee, the Subcommittee on Real Estate and Construction has considered and approved the following military transactions: Real estate, 273 projects; Capehart housing, 60 projects, 21,827 units; appropriated fund housing, 61 projects, 1,897 units; Wherry acquisition, 50 projects, 25,844 units; surplus commodity housing, 9 projects, 5,784 units.

There have been 96 printed committee hearings, containing in excess of 8,200 pages of testimony.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing represents a record of which every member of the committee can be justly proud, and I want to take this opportunity to publicly commend each of them for their outstanding efforts in the accomplishment of this record.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the committee is well aware that its efforts would be meaningless without the continuing support of the Members of the House. The committee has received the wholehearted support of the Members of the House, and for this we wish to express our deepest appreciation.

This bill authorizes Reserve facility projects as follows:

Army National Guard.....	143
Army Reserve.....	24
Naval Reserve.....	32
Marine Corps Reserve.....	4
Air Force Reserve.....	10
Air National Guard.....	29
Army National Guard (nonarmory projects).....	17
Total.....	259

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it has been my great privilege to serve in this body for 24 years. During all this time I have been a member of the Committee on Military Affairs and what is now the Committee on Armed Services. I have been proud to be a member of this committee, but I must reluctantly say I am by no means proud of what my committee presents to this House today in this conference report on the military construction bill.

I do not recall any occasion when I have opposed a conference report filed by my Committee on Armed Services. Today, for the first time in 24 years, I

rise to express my opposition to the pending report.

To be sure, this bill is important to our national defense. It authorizes many projects that I deem essential. In that respect it has considerable merit.

But there are two specific features of this measure that are of such a flagrant nature that I am constrained to vote against this conference report. I cannot in good conscience do otherwise. When I signed this report as one of the conferees I reserved the right to oppose it on the floor.

However meritorious many features of this bill may be, I would be derelict in my duty to you and to the people I represent if I did not protest against two items. At the very least, I should call your attention to them.

This bill embodies what I consider to be nothing more nor less than a legalization of a deliberate land grab for the benefit of some people at the expense of all the people we represent. This bill embodies what I shall call a \$44 million deal, for which we all shall pay, for the benefit of a few people of the State of Texas.

I raised this question before when we had the bill up for consideration. At that time I did not have all the information I now have with respect to what is known as the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot at Houston, Tex. What I then suspected I now know to be a fact.

In the form that this bill passed the House it embodied a provision which required the Secretary of the Army to sell this depot. This facility is important to our national defense. It is one of the safest and one of the best we have. It is located on the Houston ship channel, whereby we would have access to the sea. That was one of the reasons why the site was originally selected in 1941 for the location of this facility. At that time the people of Houston, Tex., were delighted that the Federal Government saw fit to place in this area a vitally important defense facility.

We have spent millions of dollars on it. It comprises 5,000 acres of land and 218 permanent buildings. It is one of the foremost ordnance depots that we have.

While everyone in the area of Houston was delighted when the site for the depot was selected, some few people in the area are now seeking to have it moved. Why? There is only one reason, although they offer others. The reason they want it moved is that the land has become so valuable.

To be sure, the land is valuable in dollars and especially valuable to any individuals whoever they may be, if they could only get possession of this land. Their possession of this land is important to them in dollars. But our possession of this land is important to us for the defense of our people. Now, I ask you, what is more important—that certain people be able to make millions of dollars, as they plan to do, at the expense of all of us, or that we retain a site for the defense of all of us.

The bill as finally agreed on in conference provides in substance that this site must be sold unless the Secretary

of Defense certifies that to sell it would be inimical to our national security. I am perfectly willing to have the Secretary of Defense make the decision as to whether it should be sold or not. But I am not willing to have the Congress direct him to sell it. That is what certain people wish to have done. They want the dollars that can be realized if they can gain possession of the land. You and I want the defense security that is gained from the Government retaining possession.

I sought to have the provision in this bill leave complete discretion in the Secretary of Defense to decide whether or not the ordnance depot should be relocated. For the first time that I can ever recall we provided in the bill as it passed the House that the depot must be sold. It must be sold regardless of its national value, and regardless of its importance to our national defense.

The bill as it now comes before you from the conference committee is not quite as mandatory. It directs that the site be sold unless it is certified by the Secretary of Defense that to sell it would be inimical to our national security. I sought to have the word "security" changed to the word "interest," that it would read to the effect that the Secretary of Defense shall sell the site unless it was inimical to our national interest. To that very simple change the conferees would not agree. Why? To sell something worth many millions of dollars and to be required to locate it elsewhere, at the expense of the American taxpayers everywhere, would obviously be against our national interest. But it would be more difficult to say that it would be against our national security if it could be located elsewhere. And so, the whole objective has been to make certain that valuable land is made available to a certain few, whatever our national interest, dollarwise or otherwise.

To such a deliberate land-grab as this I cannot agree. In due course we will have presented to us many proposals to move defense installations simply because the land where it is located has become valuable. We are here doing something that will haunt this Congress for years to come. We are here deciding that hereafter whenever and wherever a military installation is established and it is subsequently found, whatever the value of the installation to our defense, that the land has become valuable for personal profit it must be moved. Such is the precedent we are here establishing. That is what is involved here today in this conference report and I must oppose it.

There is yet another reason for my opposition to this conference report.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. Is this not the situation, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois? When the bill was before the House there was an amendment offered to strike the provision relating to the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot from the bill, and that amendment was defeated on a teller vote; is that correct?

Mr. ARENDS. That is correct.

Mr. KILDAY. Then there was a motion to recommit with instructions to eliminate the provision as to the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot from the bill, and on a roll call that motion to recommit was defeated?

Mr. ARENDS. That is correct.

Mr. KILDAY. Then in the Senate the language was made much stronger and tighter than the House language. I believe the gentleman said the provision in the conference report is not as objectionable to him as the original language.

Mr. ARENDS. The Senate provision, I agree, is much improved over the House provision.

Mr. KILDAY. Anyway, we have the situation in which the effort was made to eliminate the provision from the bill both by amendment and by a motion to recommit, neither of which carried, and then the Senate language made it more acceptable to the gentleman than was the House language and the gentleman is still opposing.

Mr. ARENDS. That is correct.

Mr. KILDAY. So the House passed on it twice.

Mr. ARENDS. Of course, I would be more pleased about the whole matter if it were stricken from the bill.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the very able and distinguished gentleman from Illinois and to associate myself with him in his views on this matter.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio very profusely. His support means a great deal to me. He has the courage of his convictions.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with everything the gentleman from Illinois has said, and add only that if this provision is approved it will be paving the way for the Texas land grab of 1958.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. I know how strongly he feels on this important matter.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Does not the gentleman think that his language is rather strong, to accuse the great Committee on Armed Services of being a conscious party to a land grab? If this is passed, it will come back to the committee and be referred to the Subcommittee on Real Estate of which the gentleman is an ex-officio member and of which I have the great honor to be chairman. We go into these matters very fully. Let me assure the gentleman that in the 18 years that I have been here, I have never been a party to any such thing as that and I, for one, can assure him that I resent being put in the category of being a conscious party to stealing property of the taxpayers of the United

States. I urge the gentleman not to accuse his colleagues on this committee of being a party to a land grab. I am not in that business, and I am sure the gentleman knows that.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the gentleman. He is an outstanding member of our committee—one of the best. I know the gentleman would only do that which he considers right. He always has and always will. It is simply a matter of evaluation of the facts and a matter of judgment as to what should or should not be done on the basis of the facts.

Mr. Speaker, there is another reason for my opposition to this conference report.

We quite frequently hear the term "pork barrel" legislation. It is a term generally applied to a public works bill. I never thought that my Committee on Armed Services, of which I have been so proud, would present to you a bill where that term "pork barrel" might be so appropriately applied.

In the form that the bill passed the House it provided for 35 new armories for the Army National Guard. It contained this provision notwithstanding that the Army National Guard has available almost \$18 million for this purpose and the Army Reserve has on hand over \$30 million. Why then did our Committee on Armed Services add 35 National Guard armories that the Department of Defense did not recommend? The committee simply decided that it would be politically astute, without anyone mentioning the word politics, if at least some provision were made for the Army National Guard and Army Reserve.

The distinguished gentlemen of the other body were even more politically astute. They added no less than 108 new National Guard armories to be authorized for construction. And what did your conferees do? They agreed that we shall have the 35 armories desired by the House, the added 108 desired by the Senate, for a total of 143 desired by both, and no 1 of them found necessary by the Department of Defense.

And yet only yesterday afternoon when the question of raising the national debt was considered, everyone who rose on the floor of the House talked about inflation in connection with the rise in the national debt. Yet we are asked to appropriate money here for the Department of Defense which the Department of Defense did not even request. It is impossible to understand such procedure. Regardless of need, regardless of cost, regardless of anything, we thus have before us a national defense bill written not solely for national defense purposes but one to satisfy the people of the Houston, Tex., area by directing the sale of valuable defense property and to satisfy the people of other areas by directing the erection of new installations.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has great merit, but I cannot be a party to using our national defense needs in this manner. I may be the only one to vote against this conference report. I do so that the people I represent may know that I shall never ask them to pay their tax money that some few may make money person-

ally or that some others may make themselves more politically popular.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as a Texan I am just as interested in anything that has to do with the disposition of installations in Texas as any of my colleagues. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman who is proposing the removal of this Ordnance Depot. But I just want to get some facts straight, because I understand we are operating at a deficit of around \$12 billion this year, and I am hardheartedly looking at the facts.

Let me ask the gentleman this question: If we add the cost of the present expenditures at the depot to the cost of a new installation elsewhere to replace it, and subtract the assets from the sale of the present location, would there then be a deficit or would there be money that would have to be taken from the Treasury to make this good?

Mr. ARENDS. The best information that I have, let me say to the able gentleman from Texas, is this. If we sell this installation and move it to another place, acquire another site, and build a similar installation, the cost to Uncle Sam, according to the figures made available to me by the Department of Defense, will be at least \$44 million less any proceeds realized from the sale of the present site.

Mr. ALGER. May I say to the gentleman, on that basis, even though I am from Texas and would like to join with those colleagues who think we should move this installation, I am opposed solely on the basis it will cost Uncle Sam. As a former realtor, I believe in the highest and best use of land. But this is also a wrong precedent, it seems to me, because now it would be wrong just to move this installation and sell the land, unless there are other compelling reasons.

Mr. ARENDS. I have no quarrel with any individual of this House, not a single Member, but here we are establishing a precedent which, I repeat, will come back to haunt each and every one of us. If we view this solely in terms of dollars and it could be shown why we should spend \$44 million to do something that has to be done, for defense purposes, I would say all right. It behooves us to do everything necessary that we have the best defense possible and, of course, that we get a dollar's worth of defense for each dollar expended.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust the House will adopt this conference report. It is founded on logic and founded on facts.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 97, noes 49.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 256, nays 135, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]

YEAS—256

Abblitt	Garmatz	Norrell
Abernethy	Gary	O'Brien, Ill.
Addonizio	Gathings	O'Brien, N. Y.
Albert	Gavin	O'Hara, Ill.
Alexander	Granahan	O'Neill
Allen, Calif.	Grant	Osmer
Anderson,	Gray	Passman
Mont.	Green, Oreg.	Patman
Andrews	Green, Pa.	Patterson
Anfuso	Griffiths	Pelly
Ashley	Gubser	Perkins
Ashmore	Gwinn	Pfost
Aspinall	Hagen	Philbin
Avery	Haley	Piicher
Bailey	Hardy	Poage
Baker	Harris	Poff
Baldwin	Harrison, Va.	Polk
Barden	Hays, Ark.	Porter
Barling	Hays, Ohio	Powell
Barrett	Healey	Preston
Bass, Tenn.	Hébert	Price
Baumhart	Hemphill	Prouty
Beckworth	Herlong	Rabaut
Bennett, Fla.	Hess	Rains
Bennett, Mich.	Hollfield	Reece, Tenn.
Blatnik	Holland	Reuss
Boggs	Holmes	Rhodes, Ariz.
Boland	Holt	Rhodes, Pa.
Bonner	Holtzman	Riley
Bow	Horan	Rivers
Boykin	Hosmer	Roberts
Boyle	Huddleston	Robeson, Va.
Bray	Ikard	Rodino
Breeding	Jarman	Rogers, Colo.
Brooks, Tex.	Jennings	Rogers, Fla.
Broomfield	Jensen	Rogers, Mass.
Brown, Ga.	Johnson	Rogers, Tex.
Brown, Mo.	Jones, Ala.	Rooney
Broyhill	Jones, Mo.	Roosevelt
Burleson	Karsten	Rutherford
Byrne, Pa.	Kearney	Sadlak
Cannon	Kearns	Santangelo
Celler	Kee	St. George
Chelf	Kelly, N. Y.	Saund
Chenoweth	Keogh	Scott, N. C.
Church	Kilday	Seely-Brown
Clark	Kilgore	Selden
Coad	King	Shelley
Coffin	Kirwan	Sheppard
Cooley	Kitchin	Sikes
Cramer	Kluczynski	Siler
Cretella	Knox	Sisk
Cunningham,	Knutson	Smith, Miss.
Iowa	Landrum	Smith, Va.
Davis, Ga.	Lane	Staggers
Dawson, Ill.	Lankford	Sullivan
Delaney	Lennon	Talle
Dellay	Libonati	Taylor
Dent	McCarthy	Teague, Calif.
Denton	McCormack	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	McDonough	Teller
Dingell	McFall	Thomas
Dollinger	McGovern	Thompson, N. J.
Donohue	McMillan	Thompson, Tex.
Dooley	Macdonald	Thornberry
Dorn, S. C.	Mack, Ill.	Tollefson
Dowdy	Mack, Wash.	Trimble
Doyle	Madden	Tuck
Durham	Magnuson	Udall
Edmondson	Mahon	Ullman
Elliott	Mailliard	Vanlk
Engle	Matthews	Vinson
Everett	Morrow	Wainwright
Fallon	Metcalfe	Walter
Faberstein	Miller, Calif.	Watts
Fascell	Mills	Whitener
Fino	Mitchell	Whitten
Fisher	Montoya	Wier
Flood	Morgan	Williams, Miss.
Flynt	Morrison	Wilson, Calif.
Fogarty	Moss	Winstead
Forand	Multer	Wright
Forrester	Murray	Yates
Fountain	Natcher	Young
Frazier	Nix	Zablocki
Fulton	Norblad	Zelenko

NAYS—135

Alger	Arends	Bates
Allen, Ill.	Auchincloss	Beamer
Andersen,	Ayres	Becker
H. Carl	Bass, N. H.	Belcher

Berry	Harden	O'Konski
Betts	Harrison, Nebr.	Ostertag
Bolton	Harvey	Pillion
Bosch	Haskell	Quile
Brown, Ohio	Henderson	Ray
Brownson	Heseltun	Reed
Budge	Hiestand	Rees, Kans.
Bush	Hilli	Riehlman
Byrne, Ill.	Hoeven	Robison, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman	Robison, Ky.
Canfield	Hyde	Saylor
Carrigg	Jackson	Schenck
Cederberg	James	Scherer
Chamberlain	Johansen	Schwengel
Chiperfield	Jonas	Scott, Pa.
Clevenger	Judd	Scrivner
Collier	Kean	Scudder
Corbett	Keating	Sheehan
Coudert	Kruger	Simpson, Ill.
Cunningham,	Lafore	Simpson, Pa.
Nebr.	Laird	Smith, Calif.
Curtin	Latham	Springer
Curtis, Mass.	LeCompte	Stauffer
Curtis, Mo.	Lipscomb	Taber
Dague	McCulloch	Tewes
Dawson, Utah	McGregor	Thomson, Wyo.
Dennison	McIntosh	Utt
Derounian	McVey	Van Pelt
Devereux	Marshall	Van Zandt
Dixon	Martin	Vorys
Dorn, N. Y.	May	Vursell
Dwyer	Meader	Weaver
Feighan	Miller, Md.	Westland
Fenton	Miller, Nebr.	Wharton
Ford	Miller, N. Y.	Widnall
Frelinghuysen	Minshall	Wigglesworth
George	Moore	Williams, N. Y.
Glenn	Morano	Wilson, Ind.
Griffin	Mumma	Withrow
Gross	Nicholson	Wolverton
Hale	Nimtz	Younger
Halleck	O'Hara, Minn.	

NOT VOTING—39

Adair	Eberharter	Mason
Bentley	Evins	Michel
Blitch	Friedel	Morris
Bolling	Gordon	Moulder
Brooks, La.	Gregory	Neal
Buckley	Hillings	Radwan
Burdick	Hull	Shuford
Byrd	Jenkins	Sleminski
Carnahan	Kilburn	Smith, Kans.
Christopher	Lesinski	Spence
Colmer	Loser	Steed
Davis, Tenn.	McIntire	Thompson, La.
Dies	Machrowicz	Willis

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Friedel for, with Mr. Jenkins against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Radwan against.
Mr. Eberharter for, with Mr. Mason against.
Mr. Machrowicz for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Brooks of Louisiana for, with Mr. Hillings against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Burdick against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bolling with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Bentley.
Mr. Loser with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Neal.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Smith of Kansas.

Mrs. HARDEN, Mr. BECKER, and Mr. UTT changed their votes from "aye" to "nay."

Messrs. SILER, JENSEN, HORAN, PATTERSON, DOOLEY, and CRETELLA changed their votes from "nay" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on the passage of the

bill H. R. 13580, to increase the public debt limit. On yesterday, the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 286, nays 108, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 156]

YEAS—286

Addonizio	Fisher	Morgan
Albert	Flood	Morrison
Alger	Fogarty	Moss
Allen, Calif.	Forand	Multer
Allen, Ill.	Ford	Mumma
Andersen,	Frazier	Murray
H. Carl	Frelinghuysen	Natcher
Anderson,	Fulton	Nix
Mont.	Garmatz	Norblad
Anfuso	Gary	Norrell
Arends	Gathings	O'Brien, Ill.
Ashley	Gavin	O'Brien, N. Y.
Aspinall	George	O'Hara, Ill.
Auchincloss	Glenn	O'Neill
Avery	Granahan	Osmer
Ayres	Gray	Ostertag
Bailey	Green, Oreg.	Patman
Baker	Green, Pa.	Patterson
Baldwin	Griffin	Perkins
Barrett	Gubser	Pfost
Bass, N. H.	Hagen	Philbin
Bass, Tenn.	Hale	Piicher
Bates	Halleck	Poage
Becker	Hardy	Polk
Beckworth	Harris	Porter
Belcher	Harrison, Va.	Powell
Bennett, Fla.	Haskell	Preston
Bennett, Mich.	Hays, Ark.	Price
Blatnik	Hays, Ohio	Prouty
Boggs	Healey	Quile
Boland	Hébert	Rabaut
Bolton	Herlong	Rains
Bosch	Heseltun	Ray
Boykin	Hess	Reece, Tenn.
Boyle	Hill	Reed
Breeding	Hollfield	Rees, Kans.
Brooks, Tex.	Holland	Reuss
Brown, Ga.	Holmes	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brown, Mo.	Holtzman	Rhodes, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Riehlman
Broyhill	Hosmer	Riley
Burleson	Huddleston	Rivers
Bush	Hyde	Roberts
Byrd	Ikard	Rodino
Byrne, Pa.	Jackson	Rogers, Colo.
Byrnes, Wis.	James	Rogers, Mass.
Canfield	Jarman	Rooney
Carrigg	Jennings	Roosevelt
Celler	Johnson	Sadlak
Chamberlain	Jones, Ala.	Santangelo
Chelf	Judd	Saund
Chenoweth	Kafsten	Saylor
Chiperfield	Kean	Schenck
Clark	Kearney	Scott, Pa.
Clevenger	Keating	Scrivner
Coad	Kee	Scudder
Coffin	Kelly, N. Y.	Seely-Brown
Cooley	Keogh	Shelley
Corbett	Kilday	Sheppard
Cretella	King	Siler
Cunningham,	Kirwan	Simpson, Pa.
Iowa	Kluczynski	Sisk
Curtin	Knutson	Smith, Miss.
Curtis, Mass.	Lafore	Smith, Va.
Curtis, Mo.	Lane	Staggers
Dague	Lankford	Steed
Dawson, Ill.	Latham	Sullivan
Dawson, Utah	LeCompte	Taber
Delaney	Libonati	Talle
Dellay	McCarthy	Taylor
Dennison	McCormack	Teague, Calif.
Dent	McCulloch	Teller
Denton	McFall	Tewes
Derounian	McGovern	Thomas
Devereux	McIntosh	Thompson, N. J.
Diggs	Mack, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Dingell	Madden	Thomson, Wyo.
Dixon	Magnuson	Thornberry
Dollinger	Mahon	Trimble
Donohue	Mailliard	Udall
Dooley	Marshall	Ullman
Dorn, N. Y.	Martin	Vanlk
Doyle	May	Van Zandt
Durham	Meader	Vinson
Dwyer	Morrow	Vorys
Edmondson	Metcalfe	Vursell
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	Wainwright
Engle	Miller, Md.	Walter
Everett	Mills	Watts
Fallon	Minshall	Westland
Farbstein	Mitchell	Whitten
Fascell	Montoya	Widnall
Feighan	Moore	Wier
Fenton	Morano	Wigglesworth

14. REP. HILL. Several Representatives paid tribute to the service of Rep. Hill, ranking minority member of the Agriculture Committee, who is retiring from Congress after this session. pp. 15223-25
15. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. At the request of Rep. McCormack unanimous consent was granted for consideration of bills under suspension of the rules Mon., Aug. 11. Rep. McCormack announced that "as far as the House is concerned, we could clean up our business pretty much in the next 10 days, the next week, probably, but the next 10 days, anyway." He also announced that the private calendar will be called Wed., Aug. 13. p. 15169

SENATE

16. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Stennis stated that defeat of the farm bill in the House might have an adverse effect on cotton, and urged that those concerned meet with Secretary Benson in an effort to reach some agreement. Sen. Aiken agreed and said he would favor calling Congress back into special session on the cotton problem if legislation were not agreed to before adjournment. pp. 15137-8
- Sens. Proxmire and Humphrey criticized Secretary Benson for the present farm program and asserted that it was hurting the farmer while "wasting the taxpayers' money" due to alleged inefficiencies in operating the program. pp. 15143-5
- Sen. Proxmire analyzed the bills he has introduced in this session and asserted that, if enacted, they would result in \$700 million net savings, including \$1 billion from adoption of S. 2952, his general farm bill. pp. 15139-43
17. ONION FUTURES. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 376, to prohibit trading in onion futures. The report reduces the maximum penalty for violation from \$10,000 fine plus imprisonment to \$5,000, and retains onions under the jurisdiction of CEA. p. 15133
18. FARMER COMMITTEES. Began debate on S. 1436, to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to revise the procedures governing the election of farmer committeemen and the administration of the farm program by the committees. Sens. Proxmire and Humphrey urged enactment of the bill in order to strengthen local controls over farm programs. pp. 15161, 15164-6
19. SEED WHEAT. Passed without amendment H. R. 11581, to remove wheat for seeding purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances from the unfit for human consumption category of Sec. 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. S. 666, a similar bill, was indefinitely postponed. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 15133, 15153
20. SURPLUS COMMODITIES; FOREIGN TRADE. Passed without amendment H. R. 13268, to authorize CCC to purchase flour and cornmeal for donation instead of being limited to having such products processed from its own stocks. S. 3858, a similar bill, was indefinitely postponed. The House report was printed in the Record (pp. 15153-5). This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 15155
21. WOOL. Sens. Mansfield and Neuberger urged extension of the National Wool Act. pp. 15163-4
22. MINERALS. Agreed to the House amendment to S. 3817, to encourage exploration for minerals in the U. S. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 15139

Senate - Aug. 7, 1958

Agreed to the conference report on S. 2069, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to promote the development of coal on the public domain. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 15164

23. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 13015, the military construction appropriation bill for 1959. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 15148-53
24. DESERT-LAND ENTRIES; RECLAMATION. Adopted S. Con. Res. 112 and S. Con. Res. 113, to request the President to return enrolled bills S. 359, to permit desert land entries on disconnected tracts of land up to 320 acres, and S. 4002, to authorize the Grey Reef dam and reservoir as part of the Glendo unit, Missouri River Basin project, to be reenrolled with certain language changes. p. 15130
25. MARGARINE. The Armed Services Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 912, to amend the Navy ration statute to permit the serving of oleo-margarine and margarine. pp. D810-11
26. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported without amendment H. R. 1168, to restore the pay of officers or employees to the level of the grade held before downgrading in certain cases. p. D811
27. FORESTRY. Sen. Clark called attention to forestry expansion in Pa., and inserted two articles on the development of the paper industry there. pp. 15135-6
28. SMALL BUSINESS. Agreed to the conference report on S. 3651, the Small Business Investment Administration bill. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 15159-61
Sens. Thyne, Sparkman, Mundt, and Bridges discussed passage of the small business tax revision bill, and Sens. Mundt and Bridges commended the efforts of Sen. Thyne for small business. pp. 15156-9
29. ECONOMIC SITUATION. Sen. Martin, Pa., asserted that inflation can only be solved by a mechanism to tie wage increases to productivity gains and stated that the addition of price stability as a goal to the Employment Act of 1946 would be of little value in securing confidence in the Government. pp. 15161-2
30. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield announced the addition of S. 4146, to provide incentive payments to producers of strategic minerals, and S. 4162, to amend the Defense Production Act to increase the amount of the loan fund, to the list of bills for consideration on Fri., Aug. 8. He stated there would be no session on Sat., Aug. 9. A call of the Calendar was ordered for Mon., Aug. 11. pp. 15156, 15166

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

31. TVA. Extension of remarks of Rep. Dooley opposing S. 1869, which would authorize TVA to issue and sell bonds to assist in financing power programs. pp. A7102-3
Extension of remarks of Rep. Byrne opposing this bill, favoring the omnibus rivers and harbors bill and the St. Lawrence seaway. pp. A7104-5
32. FAIR TRADE. Rep. Alger inserted "pertinent" remarks on the proposed fair trade bill made by Robert A. Bicks of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division. pp. A7118-9

I will now discuss some of the more important points in the conference. The conference agreement retains the entire amount of \$140 million inserted by the Senate for the strategic airlift. It includes half of the amount inserted by the Senate for KC-135 tankers. It also includes funds for jet training airplanes, which had been deleted by the House.

It also includes substantial restorations for aircraft initial spare parts. On the other hand, the Senate was forced to accede to the wishes of the House in regard to the deletion of the 13 B-52-G bombers and the 30 F-27 jet transports.

The conference agreed on a 900,000-man Army, a 400,000-man Army National Guard,

a 300,000-man Army Reserve, and a 200,000-man Marine Corps. For the National Guard and Reserve, specific language was included to provide that strength. Added funds for the modernization of Army equipment, for the Navy's Polaris and Regulus submarine programs, and for Minuteman and Hound-dog, had been approved previously by both Houses and were not subjects of conference agreement.

The House agreed to the construction of an amphibious assault ship, an amphibious transport dock, and the construction of two destroyer escort vessels.

Language agreed to will make available \$80 million to commercial air transportation

activities for the services of the Military Air Transport Service.

I have provided a brief summary of the bill. I believe it to be immeasurably stronger than when it was first presented in January. I trust it will be enacted promptly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing the figures included in the conference report.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Department of Defense—Congressional action on fiscal year 1959 budget request, by appropriation title, H. R. 12738, regular Defense Department appropriation bill, military functions

Department and appropriation title (1)	Appropriations, fiscal year 1958 (2)	Budget estimate (revised) 1959 (3)	House action (4)	Senate action (5)	Conference agreement (6)
TITLE I—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE					
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary of Defense	\$15,900,000	\$15,900,000	\$15,600,000	\$15,600,000	\$15,600,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of Public Affairs	450,000	500,000	450,000	385,000	417,000
Salaries and expenses, advanced research projects, Department of Defense		520,000,000	520,000,000	520,000,000	520,000,000
Total, title I	16,350,000	536,400,000	536,050,000	535,985,000	536,017,000
TITLE II—INTERSERVICE ACTIVITIES					
Claims	12,000,000	18,620,000	16,520,000	16,520,000	16,520,000
Contingencies	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
Emergency fund	85,000,000	85,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000
Transfer authority	150,000,000	500,000,000	100,000,000	200,000,000	150,000,000
Retired pay	555,000,000	640,000,000	600,000,000	640,000,000	640,000,000
Salaries and expenses, Court of Military Appeals	375,000	380,000	380,000	380,000	380,000
Total, title II	682,375,000	774,000,000	796,900,000	836,900,000	836,900,000
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Military personnel	¹ 3,113,000,000	¹ 3,284,761,000	¹ 2,946,400,000	¹ 3,225,961,000	¹ 3,175,961,000
Operation and maintenance	3,215,000,000	3,036,300,000	3,078,208,000	3,107,200,000	3,078,208,000
Reserve personnel	² 197,000,000	194,500,000	202,499,000	222,759,000	222,759,000
Army National Guard	333,800,000	310,374,000	325,419,000	342,093,000	342,093,000
Research and development	400,000,000	498,700,000	498,700,000	498,700,000	498,700,000
National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice	250,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Communication System	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
Procurement of equipment and missiles		1,623,100,000	1,659,600,000	1,674,349,000	1,669,338,000
Total, title III	7,264,550,000	8,953,535,000	8,716,625,000	9,076,862,000	8,992,859,000
TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY					
Military personnel, Navy	¹ 2,295,000,000	¹ 2,423,970,000	¹ 2,263,568,000	¹ 2,385,720,000	¹ 2,385,720,000
Reserve personnel, Navy	86,000,000	90,098,000	84,735,000	90,098,000	90,098,000
Navy personnel, general expenses	87,000,000	86,305,000	85,000,000	86,305,000	85,442,000
Military personnel, Marine Corps	¹ 630,000,000	¹ 625,242,000	¹ 604,056,000	¹ 635,692,000	¹ 635,692,000
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps	23,200,000	23,760,000	23,000,000	23,760,000	23,760,000
Marine Corps procurement		30,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Marine Corps troops and facilities	178,000,000	168,242,000	173,127,000	173,117,000	173,117,000
Aircraft and related procurement	1,837,000,000	2,089,295,000	1,947,095,000	2,080,120,000	2,033,795,000
Aircraft and facilities	853,500,000	843,808,000	836,508,000	846,308,000	837,868,000
Shipbuilding and conversion	1,800,000,000	1,587,800,000	2,016,400,000	2,069,400,000	2,069,400,000
Ships and facilities	820,000,000	790,436,000	773,710,000	785,436,000	780,408,000
Procurement and ordnance and ammunition	207,800,000	563,855,000	597,535,000	607,535,000	602,535,000
Ordnance and facilities	164,000,000	149,850,000	149,850,000	149,850,000	149,850,000
Medical care	85,200,000	88,423,000	86,253,000	89,598,000	89,598,000
Civil engineering	134,630,000	126,554,000	125,554,000	126,554,000	125,554,000
Research and development	527,200,000	750,085,000	821,285,000	821,285,000	821,285,000
Servicewide supply and finance	300,000,000	312,581,000	309,637,000	311,081,000	309,637,000
Servicewide operations	107,000,000	118,214,000	118,214,000	118,985,000	118,985,000
Naval petroleum reserves	825,000	1,683,000	1,683,000	1,683,000	1,683,000
Total, title IV	10,216,355,000	10,870,181,000	11,042,210,000	11,427,527,000	11,359,427,000
TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE					
Aircraft, missiles, and related procurement	5,886,000,000	6,407,200,000	6,308,400,000	6,878,850,000	6,643,475,000
Procurement other than aircraft and missiles	1,531,500,000	2,195,700,000	2,195,700,000	2,231,739,000	2,220,020,000
Research and development	691,000,000	728,000,000	743,000,000	743,000,000	743,000,000
Operation and maintenance	4,092,120,000	4,100,000,000	4,049,875,000	4,094,975,000	4,053,975,000
Military personnel	3,801,600,000	3,927,873,000	3,732,200,000	3,923,073,000	3,923,073,000
Reserve personnel	55,000,000	53,746,000	50,500,000	53,746,000	53,746,000
Air National Guard	263,000,000	240,335,000	238,100,000	240,335,000	240,335,000
Total, title V	16,320,220,000	17,652,854,000	17,317,775,000	18,165,718,000	17,877,624,000
Total, titles I, II, III, IV, and V	34,499,850,000	38,786,970,000	38,409,561,000	40,042,992,000	39,602,827,000

¹ In addition, the following amounts to be derived by transfer from revolving fund:

	Fiscal year 1958	Fiscal year 1959, budget	Fiscal year 1959, House action	Fiscal year 1959, Senate action	Fiscal year 1959, conference agreement
Military personnel:					
Army	\$400,000,000	\$225,000,000	\$425,000,000	\$325,000,000	\$375,000,000
Navy	190,000,000	100,000,000	135,000,000	135,000,000	135,000,000
Marine Corps			25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Total	590,000,000	325,000,000	585,000,000	485,000,000	535,000,000

² In addition, \$10,000,000 reappropriation.

CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of August 5, 1958, pp. 14866-14878, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report, and in connection therewith I have a fairly brief statement to make on the major points involved.

The report was signed by all the conferees on the part of the House and by all the conferees on the part of the Senate. It has already been agreed to by the House.

With respect to the net money figures in the bill, there was not much change in the conference report as compared with the form in which the bill passed the Senate.

There is one particular phase of the Senate version which is carried forward in the conference report, to which I think special attention should be called. I refer to the provision with reference to our defense missile systems. Authorization was given, in effect, to the Secretary of Defense for the Nike family of missiles and Bomarc, with the expectation that there would be forthcoming a decision as to which of those two programs would be used. It was expected that perhaps one might be discarded and the other adopted. The authorization provided that it was not necessary for the Secretary of Defense to discard one in favor of the other, but that he might adopt both.

A further provision was made, that there be a reduction of 20 percent in the amount authorized for the two systems. The amounts were added together, reduced 20 percent, and the remaining 80 percent was the amount authorized. That provision is carried forward in the conference version of the bill, which we believe will lead to a new step forward in the defense missile programs. There is a possibility not only of saving several hundred million dollars in the immediate future, but perhaps, over the years, several billion dollars.

I hope, too, that this will be a landmark in the transition from so much emphasis on point defense or purely defensive measures to more emphasis on our ground striking power, which I believe is the primary mission of the Army, and that we will develop a "hard bone and muscle" Army, with the carrying ca-

capacity, including airlift, to put it at any point in the world, not for aggression, but for protection of our foreign policy.

The report filed by the committee and the amendments we offered were measures in this direction. I am glad to see that the Senate concept was retained in the bill as a result of the conference.

There were some Senators who had a special interest in various items, and they may now wish to ask some questions about them. I see the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] on the floor. He took a very active part in the formulation of the Senate bill and in the conference. I yield the floor, so that he may address the Senate if he wishes to do so.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, there are 2 or 3 points in the conference report which I believe should be mentioned as a matter of emphasis. First of all, I should like to call attention in the conference agreement to the defense missile problem as one which I believe should commend itself to the Senate. The Senate had provided that the Secretary of Defense should make determination with respect to which missiles or combination of which missiles should be employed. The conference agreement does not lessen the Secretary's responsibility in that regard. The conferees did, however, agree to make the authorizations for construction of defense missile installations and facilities available to the Secretary of the Army or to the Secretary of the Air Force, subject to a determination by the Secretary of Defense. However, by changing the language in section 402 of the bill, we provided that, following such determination, the Secretary of Defense shall have authority to transfer such funds as may be made available pursuant to the authorizations contained in such sections for such installations and facilities to the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, to enable such Secretary to utilize the authority contained in such sections in accordance with such determination.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That provision is in keeping with the conference agreement on the military reorganization bill. The military reorganization bill also places within the hands of the Secretary of Defense the responsibility for making decisions with respect to the use of new weapons or weapons systems. This agreement by the conferees on the military construction bill is consistent with and carries forward this concept of the reorganization bill.

The Secretary of Defense will be expected to make decisions necessary to choose, for example, whether a Nike or a Bomarc system shall be used in defense at a particular point or in a particular area.

The chairman of the subcommittee has well pointed out that this should make it possible for the Government to save a great deal of money, not only in connection with these particular installations, but also in the years to come.

The staggering fact for everyone who is dealing with military appropriations or military authorizations these days is that, in addition to the initial cost of the weapons or the weapons systems, and in addition to the initial cost of the facilities or installations, there is the continuing and often greater cost of operating the systems.

The only way these costs can be held within any bounds at all is by taking every possible step to insure the elimination of duplication. The language in the military reorganization bill and the language in this authorization bill represent a definite effort on the part of the committee members, who have responsibility in these fields, to bring about such savings.

In addition, I should like to invite attention to the provisions which relate to the acquisition of Wherry projects. In the original consideration of the bill in subcommittee, the members of the subcommittee were unanimous in the belief that we ought not to place on the Government any additional burden in the acquisition of projects at this time, and, perhaps even more emphatically, we ought not to write into legislation requirements which would increase the cost to the Government in the acquisition of those projects.

The conference agreement retains the language which the Senate version of the bill contained. However, in my judgment it improves it in one respect. That is with respect to the authority given for the selection of commissioners to assist the courts or to act for the courts in determining the final value to be paid when a Wherry project is to be acquired by condemnation.

The bill as it emerged from the Senate carried the word "shall." The conferees changed that word to "may." Thereby it makes it possible for the courts to employ impartial commissioners in determining the value or the price that ought to be paid, but does not make it mandatory.

All of us would agree that where these acquisitions are to be made, they should be made as expeditiously as possible. It was felt that in some cases the courts are so loaded with work that it may be impossible for them to give as prompt attention to the determination of a price as the courts themselves would like to do. In such cases, for the purpose of expediting the acquisition, the conference agreement wisely makes it possible for the courts to name impartial commissioners to assist in determining the value.

Finally, Mr. President, I should like to refer to the action of the conferees on the Reserve Forces facilities. The House had placed in the authorization bill certain authorizations, and had used a line-item procedure, naming certain facilities which might be constructed for the Reserve components, including the National Guard.

The Senate committee went further and spelled out the authorization for additional facilities. There was a great deal of difference of opinion around the conference table as to whether we should have used the line-item procedure in any

respect. However, since the House had done it and the Senate had added to it on its own initiative, we concluded to leave in all the authorizations contained in the Senate version.

In doing so the conferees wished to make it clear that this was not a list to establish new priorities to take precedence over National Guard armories or other Reserve facilities which had previously received the approval of the Committees on Armed Services of the House and Senate. Under existing law, proposals for the construction of facilities are submitted to the Committees on Armed Services and then, in turn, to the Subcommittees on Military Construction for consultation. The committees have cleared several National Guard armory projects in the several States which have not been constructed as yet. The agreement in the report to the line items specified in the bill does give them a priority status, but they are to be supplemental to the previously authorized armories.

I ask the chairman of the subcommittee if I am not correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from South Dakota is eminently correct. The addition of the second list of armories and related matters is not a new priority; it is a supplemental list. What actually will control, after all, is the selection by the States, as well as those which meet the criteria of the Department of Defense. It would be well for every Senator to understand this, for he may have correspondence on the subject.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The items specified in the bill were taken from the priority lists recommended by the several States, were they not?

Mr. STENNIS. Every single one of them was taken from the priority lists sent to Congress by the States through the National Guard Bureau. We had to reject all other suggestions. One suggestion made on the floor, in the nature of an amendment, also was rejected by the Senate, because it had not been processed in this manner.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was pleased to observe that the conferees agreed substantially on the position taken by the Senate committee with respect to authorizations for additional military family housing projects. In our committee, we had felt that some guidelines should be established as to the number of housing units which might be constructed at military establishments. It has always been our desire that an ample supply be provided, but we felt that some limitations should be imposed, so that military housing would not exceed the natural, normal requirements, and so that a certain amount of housing would be provided by the local communities. The conference agreement preserves the position of the Senate in that respect.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from South Dakota has spoken correctly on this matter. I should like to say a word concerning the Reserve and National Guard armory figures to which the Senator from South Dakota has alluded.

An authorization was requested for Navy and Marine Corps armories and

Reserve buildings in the amount of \$12 million, and for Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard, \$18 million. No new authorizations were requested for the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard.

The House added to the bill, as I have outlined, 35 National Guard armories, at a cost of \$5 million. The Senate agreed to not only those 35, but added a number of armories, so as to make a total of 142 eligible, and provided the sum of approximately \$15 million in authorizations for that purpose. We provided in the bill a total authorization of approximately \$20 million for Army National Guard, and an additional \$3 million for nonarmory construction, and for the Army Reserve, \$5 million.

In conference, all the Senate amendments pertaining to Reserve construction were adopted. But I point out that the bill does not provide any money. It simply authorizes a list of certain facilities. Changing situations at the State level may take them off the list. Congress, however, has nothing to do with that. The list of authorizations for facilities which are in the bill came with State approval under State priority lists. We certainly expect to adhere to such a list in the future and not disturb in any way the power of the States to make the eligibility lists; for, as we know, the States are paying a part of the money for the facilities.

It is interesting to note that \$35 million of State matching funds have already been actually provided and are in the bank, so to speak, awaiting the matching funds of the Federal Government.

We think that time has proved, in many instances, that one of the very best investments Congress makes in all military programs is the relatively small amounts which are spent for armory and similar facilities to develop the right kind of Reserve and National Guard units.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a complete statement which has been prepared concerning the conference report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS

The report as agreed to by the conferees is in general, substantially the same as the Senate version of the bill. They are covered in more detail in the statement of managers, Report No. 2429, beginning on page 41, so I will outline but briefly.

TITLE I—ARMY

Within the Army title of the bill as approved by the Senate, there were five line items subject to conference consideration. Two of these items pertained to a hospital at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., in the amount of \$1,900,000, and another hospital at Fort McClellan, Ala., in the amount of \$3,331,000; the Senate conferees agreed to reinstate the authority. As will be remembered, the Senate originally denied the authorization for these two hospitals because of its belief that existing medical facilities were not being utilized to the extent of their capacity. However, prior to the conference, the Army produced additional information strengthening the justification for these two new fa-

cilities, and hence it was deemed advisable to reinstate the authorizations.

There is another change with respect to the Army title, and as this pertains to the subject of missiles, specifically Nike and Bomarc, I shall cover the subject later in my remarks on title IV of the bill.

One other area of change occurred with respect to the \$25 million emergency construction authorization granted each of the three Services by the Senate approved version. The House and Senate conferees agreed by setting the sum of \$17,500,000 as an amount adequate to cover the contingencies contemplated by this provision of the bill for the ensuing fiscal year.

TITLE II—NAVY

The conference resulted in four changes to title II (Navy) as originally approved by the Senate. The House had included an item for \$10 million for a dry dock at Charleston, S. C. The Senate version contained no authorization for this facility. It was agreed that the Navy should be authorized the sum of \$500,000 in order to provide for necessary design, plans, and other work preliminary to the initiation of construction—inasmuch as the Department of the Navy indicated that the facility would be required in the future.

The second item pertains to a classified facility at Charleston, S. C., in the amount of \$10,300,000. This was not contained in the Senate version but was in the House act. Subsequent to the termination of the Senate hearings, the Department of Defense provided information that this facility was approved and urgently needed—hence all conferees agreed to its inclusion. One additional item in the amount of approximately \$1,200,000 for a classified facility was deleted pending further study and possible resubmission in next year's construction authorization bill.

The only other change in the Navy title pertains to the authorization of 1,000 family-housing units to be constructed at the Navy Base, San Diego, Calif. This item was presented as an approved project by Department of Defense subsequent to the passage of the bill by the Senate.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

Only one change was made in the line item of title III (Air Force) portion of the bill. The Senate conferees agreed to the inclusion of \$925,000 for the construction of troop housing at Barksdale Air Force Base, La., predicated upon the receipt of information that the construction of these facilities would not exceed the committee criteria.

TITLE IV—SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

In title IV of the bill, it will be remembered that the Senate version deleted certain funds from the Army and Air Force titles pertaining to construction of facilities for defense missiles (Nike and Bomarc). During the conference it was agreed to reinstate these authorizations subject to certain provisions in section 402 designed to carry out the Senate's original intent. The language of section 402 is quoted, as follows:

"Sec. 402. The Secretary of Defense or his designee shall, prior to the utilization of the funds authorized by sections 102 and 302 of this act for establishing or developing classified military installations and facilities for defense missiles by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force, respectively, determine with respect to each defended area, which missile or combination of missiles will be employed in that area. In making such determination, the Secretary of Defense shall have the authority to transfer such funds as may be made available pursuant to the authorizations contained in such sections for such installations and facilities, to the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, to enable such Secretaries to utilize the authority contained in such sections in accordance with such determinations."

In summation then, the totals of the bill as changed by the conference are as follows: Title I (Army) as originally approved by the Senate authorized a total amount of new authorizations of \$201,963,000; the resulting conference figure is \$309,466,000. For the Navy, the Senate figure was \$323,887,000; the conference figure was \$325,994,000. For the Air Force, the Senate version was \$885,390,000; the conference amount is \$952,415,000. The Secretary of Defense (title IV), the Senate amount was \$233,401,000; the conference version is \$50 million. The total of new authorizations were therefore, \$1,644,641,000 as approved by the Senate, and \$1,637,875,000 as a result of the conference (a difference of \$6,766,000).

The substantive changes appearing in titles I, III, and IV are basically the shifting of dollar authorizations pertaining to the construction of defense missile facilities, previously mentioned.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

With regard to title V, that portion pertaining to General Provisions, the conferees adopted the Senate version with a few minor changes, and one substantive change. The minor changes were simply designed to clarify the original Senate intent.

The substantive change pertains to section 513 which dealt with certain procedures relative to the acquisition of Wherry projects under condemnation. The original Senate language called for the mandatory establishment of an impartial commission to assist the court in determining the final value. As a result of the conference, the word "shall" was changed to "may" thereby in effect making the establishment of the commission permissive at the discretion of the court.

TITLE VI—RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

As will be remembered, this year for the first time the annual military construction authorization bill contained new authorizations for both the Active and Reserve Forces, including the National Guard. Title VI pertains to Reserve Forces Facilities. The conferees accepted the Senate version in its entirety.

All conferees agreed to the extreme importance of our Reserve components to the national defense. As originally submitted from the Department of Defense, the proposed legislation contained no requests for additional authorizations for Army Reserve nor Army National Guard projects.

The House-passed bill contained added authorization for 35 National Guard armories at a cost of approximately \$5 million; the Senate version added 108 eligible armories at an additional cost of approximately \$15 million. Both bills contained certain added authorization for the Organized Reserves.

For the benefit of the Senate, I would like to review briefly the underlying reasons for the Senate's actions in this area in order that the record may be perfectly clear.

As originally presented, the Reserve construction authorization bill contained authorization requests amounting to approximately \$30 million providing close to \$12 million for the Navy and Marine Corps, and approximately \$18 million for Air Force Reserves and Air National Guard, and with none, as indicated before, for the Army Reserve and Army National Guard. The Department of Defense indicated no additional authorities were requested for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve because there existed a carry-over into fiscal year 1959 from prior year authorizations in an amount of approximately \$45 million. The inference was that this \$45 million was considered adequate to provide construction for the next 12 months. The Senate took exception to this philosophy. It considered the National Guard and the Organized Reserve as absolutely essential to this Nation's defense, and indicated its belief that our Reserve components must be provided with adequate

armories and the other facilities needed for their training.

During hearings last year, it was indicated that there were better than 2,000 locations where Army Reserve training was being carried on and that of these, only 551 were considered adequate. In the case of the Army National Guard, it was stated that of a total requirement for 2,700 units, there remained 800 locations to be established or improved, and yet the Defense Department requested no additional authorizations for Army Reserve and Army National Guard. This was surprising in view of the fact that the Senate had been informed that various States and communities had previously made available approximately \$35 million as their contribution, therefore if the Federal Government were to provide its 75 percent share, there would need to be made available almost \$100 million more.

Various charts presented during the hearings indicated that the total amount of authorizations requested represented only 2.6 percent of the total requirement. If this percentage is added to that already in being or under contract, there remains 46.9 percent to be filled. At this rate, it would take nearly 15 years to provide the estimated requirements for all Reserve components.

During this year's hearings, senior National Guard officials indicated "a dire need for many new National Guard armories."

At the Senate's request, the National Guard Bureau submitted a list of various projects in accord with requests and priorities established by the States involved, with State-matching funds and sites already available. It was indicated that these projects, armory and non-armory, had already been reviewed for compliance with Department of Defense criteria and a continuing requirement under the new forces structure of the Army National Guard, and that all were considered essential and eligible for Federal participation.

As a result of the foregoing, the Senate added line item projects in the amount of approximately \$23 million for the Army National Guard, and approximately \$5 million for the Army Reserve.

During the hearings, Assistant Secretary of Defense Floyd S. Bryant, by letter dated June 18, 1958, furnished the Senate a list of projects for each Reserve component by location, type, and an indication of those for which the existing authorizations would carry over into fiscal year 1959. In taking the action to add as line items, the projects for the Army National Guard and for Army Reserve, the Senate emphasized that this additional authorization would be in addition to projects heretofore approved and to those covered in the carry-over list conveyed by Secretary Bryant's letter. These authorizations are not intended as a priority but rather as a supplement to the previously mentioned list.

The conferees agreed to the Senate amendment which included the additional Army Reserve and Army National Guard armories. Of course these are only authorizations. Actual construction will depend on the amount of the appropriations and the ultimate decisions of the Department of Defense.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to make a brief statement, and then to ask the Senator from Mississippi a few questions. I commend the Senator from Mississippi and the other members of the Subcommittee on Military Housing of the Committee on Armed Services upon their handling of the bill, upon the bill, and upon the conference report, in every respect except one. That deals

with subsection (d) of section 513, which has to do with the condemnation of Wherry housing by the Government, and the compensation which will be paid therefor.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Tennessee has been particularly concerned about this subject. It is an important one. He has worked on it throughout most of the session, I think, because he has come before the committee and has communicated with us many times about this problem and its many phases.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Tennessee and the other members of the committee have been considerate in hearing those of us who are interested in the matter. But I should like to state the background of the matter.

The Government of the United States, wishing to further the free-enterprise system and to have private investors build housing for military personnel, embarked upon the so-called Wherry program by asking investors to invest their own money to construct military housing, the property, of course, to be rented back to the Government.

Wherry housing projects, by and large, are located in places where they are useful only to the United States Government for the housing of personnel. That is, they are not located in metropolitan areas, where such housing could be used, rented, or sold for the housing of civilian or other personnel. They are of value, largely, only to the United States Government.

It should be borne in mind that the people who invested their money to build Wherry housing are not asking that the Government take the property back. This is a reversal of attitude on the part of the Government, whereby the Government is taking the initiative by passing a law to take back the property, either by negotiation or condemnation.

I do not want the persons who have in good faith made these investments to get an unreasonable amount, but I hope they will get fair and just compensation for the property which the Government is taking back either by negotiation or by condemnation.

I am afraid that the provision upon which the subcommittee has agreed in conference—and I was very hopeful that the criteria would be changed in conference—may not provide just compensation for the Wherry housing owners. It should be remembered that the Committee on Banking and Currency and its Subcommittee on Housing held hearings on this particular subject. They concluded that this was an unusual situation; that the ordinary elements of value, under which these projects could be compared with something else nearby, did not apply. They decided that it was a unique situation.

They concluded that a mandatory provision for a commission was the correct one, and also that among the elements of value to be considered were the cost of construction, the cost of replacement, and fair depreciation.

The housing bill, as passed by the Senate, included that provision; and the bill

is now before the House of Representatives.

With all due deference to the Armed Services Committee, of which I have the great honor to be a member, I believe we should give particular attention to the views of members of the committee who have special interests in housing matters and who also have a large degree of expert knowledge on the subject.

The conferees have voted to strike out the word "shall", and to insert the word "may", as in the present law, so the phrase will read "may be considered by the commission."

I have as much respect as does any other Member of the Senate for the judgments of juries; but it is well known that today many courts of the Nation are hopelessly bogged down.

The persons involved in this matter need the money immediately. In many instances, the amounts paid are very small, in comparison with the amounts to which the persons involved are entitled.

Furthermore, the property involved is unique. It is not valued on the basis of the usual valuations, because this property has value only or primarily to the Government of the United States. Therefore, intricate accounting in regard to the rate of return and depreciation is involved. Prompt action should be taken, so as to enable the owners to receive more speedy consideration. Provision should also be made to have the valuation made by persons who are competent to render very expert judgment in regard to the question of what is a fair valuation. That condition would be met if the matters were handled by a commission, as we have proposed.

So, in the first place, I am disappointed that the provision for commission consideration was deleted in the conference.

In evaluating other property which is in a peculiar situation—for instance, in cases under the Tennessee Valley Authority Act and in cases relating to the District of Columbia—valuation by a commission is mandatory.

Second, many of the condemnation laws provide special guidelines for consideration in connection with the determination of the value. It is usually provided that, among other matters to be considered in arriving at the value, such and such should be considered.

Inasmuch as the property involved in this instance is of a specialized, unique type, and inasmuch as the property has value in substantial amount only to the Government of the United States, and inasmuch as the Government is initiating the action for the taking back of property which was built in good faith, it seems to me that in this instance the rule to be applied should be the value of the property to the Government of the United States.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is a member of the Armed Services Committee, and who has had great experience with this matter, has made the same recommendation.

So I am sorry the conference report does not include a provision for some guidelines of this type.

Can the Senator from Mississippi give us any assurance that the value to the Government will be one of the elements to be considered in arriving at the value? Can he also give us any assurance that the construction cost, the cost of replacement, and fair depreciation will be considered?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be very glad to answer the question as best I can.

First, by way of background, let me point out that the enforced sale of such Wherry housing occurs only in cases in which the armed services propose to build Capehart housing. One reason why the law provides that Wherry housing shall be taken over first is that it would be unfair to the owners of Wherry housing to provide for the construction of Capehart housing, which then would compete with the Wherry housing.

The Armed Services Committee first provided for the inclusion of a provision which would give protection to the owners, and also for the inclusion of a provision that the condemnation procedure would be open, and that the owners could go through the condemnation procedures under the rules established in the courts in the respective communities.

It was for that reason that the Senate Armed Services Committee took the position that it would not undertake to provide, in this connection, the laws which would control in the trial of such cases. The position of the committee was that it is not proper to have 1 foot in the courtroom and 1 foot outside the courtroom; that when a case of this sort goes into court, those involved in the case are clothed with all the protections afforded by the rules of evidence and rules regarding value which prevail in the jurisdictions concerned, and that those protections are afforded to all the parties involved; all will be bound by the same rules.

As a lawyer, I would say that the point the Senator from Tennessee has made, namely, about the special, peculiar value of these houses to the Government of the United States, would certainly be considered; I believe that their special, peculiar value would certainly be considered as being among the elements of value which, in my opinion, would apply and would be proper for consideration. If I were ruling on such a matter, from a judicial standpoint, I would admit evidence in that connection.

But when it is proposed that we write such rules into the law, we should consider that if we were to do so, we could be changing local rules to that extent. Once that process were begun, soon, no doubt, further changes of that sort would be requested, and soon thereafter other changes would be requested, and there would be no end to the process.

So we have provided for the rules which will apply in all cases, whether the matter involved is in Knoxville, Tenn., in California, in New Hampshire, or elsewhere in the Nation. We believe that provision will serve well.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But it is not unusual to include in condemnation statutes, as the Senator from Mississippi well knows, a provision in regard to

guidelines with respect to the elements to be considered in connection with other values. That has been done many times. The law does not say that such elements of value shall be the only ones to be considered; it merely provides that attention shall be given particularly to the unique type of property being condemned or taken.

I have been advised by owners of Wherry housing in Tennessee that the Department of Justice, in connection with its consideration of these matters, will not give any consideration to the unique value to the Federal Government, and does not seem to be willing to give much consideration to the replacement cost or the fair depreciation. I have also been advised that unless some provision of the sort to which I have referred is included in this measure, or, at least, unless some strong legislative history in that connection is established, the owners of such housing simply will not receive fair compensation.

Mr. STENNIS. Certainly it is the hope and the purpose of the committee to provide them with a proper forum in which they will receive just compensation. But we cannot find better rules for application than the prevailing rules which apply to others.

When peculiar circumstances exist—regardless of the situation existing in various other communities—evidence regarding them will clearly be admissible.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But I do not think any other type of property to be condemned would be in exactly the same situation as that of the Wherry housing in Tennessee. Those affected are very fearful that the rules which are applicable there will not permit this unique situation to be taken into consideration.

Mr. STENNIS. Certainly the court has discretionary power in regard to the admission of evidence of that kind, in order to meet the situations which develop. And I believe the average court will act to meet such situations.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator from Mississippi agree that this Wherry housing is unique and unusual, in that it was built for a particular purpose, to wit, the housing of governmental personnel, including military personnel; and that unless consideration is given to the value of this housing, when it continues to be used for that purpose, fair treatment will not be given to the owners who may have to give up their property?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi understands many of them are quite unique as to location and surrounding circumstances. It is a very clear illustration of what is meant by stating the court shall apply rules that will fit the particular case.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The statement of the Senator from Mississippi about this matter gives me some comfort. I know the conference report has already been adopted by the House of Representatives. I still believe this particular section in the conference report is not satisfactory, and I oppose it, but I agree to the rest of it.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's position. He certainly has worked

diligently and has been helpful to us in formalizing and finalizing these provisions.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. The Congress of the United States has no more important function to perform than to provide adequately for the national defense. The very survival of our Nation depends upon it.

I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for his interest and his fine work in behalf of our national defense, and to commend him especially for the magnificent work he has done on this particular piece of legislation.

I recall in our State there were two projects of great importance being considered for national defense. They were not included in the Senate bill. I talked with the Senator about them. One of the projects, a classified project, was included in the conference bill; and as to the other, relating to drydocks at Charleston, which is a very important project, a provision has been made for planning money. I wanted to have the Senator from Mississippi confirm that is the case.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The Senator from South Carolina had called these two projects in his State to our special attention and worked with us some weeks before the bill was written up. One of the classified projects, which is now in the bill, and which involves a considerable amount of money, was thoroughly considered by the committee; but at that time there was some uncertainty on the part of the Navy and the Department of Defense as to what would be their position with reference to continuing it or constructing it this year.

While the matter was still in abeyance, the committee had to close its hearings and write up the bill. The project was left out of the bill, but we continued to keep it on our active list for consideration. In the meantime the Navy confirmed its position, as did the Department of Defense. They not only asked for the authorization, but for money, which was being appropriated at about the same time. We are very glad the project is included in the bill.

The other major project, so far as the Senator from South Carolina is concerned, had the same history. It was covered in conference by providing \$500,000 for plans for the design and other activities incident to the drydocks at Charleston.

So far as now can be foreseen, the project will be continued. The project could not be completed in the next 12 months anyway. The amount provided is ample for planning. I know the project will continue to have the interest of the Senator from South Carolina, as it will that of the committee.

Mr. THURMOND. In including the classified project in the bill, I believe the Senator from Mississippi has rendered a great service to our national defense. I appreciate his words with re-

spect to the drydocks, for which planning money has been provided. I presume the plans are to carry it forward next year.

Mr. STENNIS. I understand that the Navy so expects. I hope so. The committee will be interested in following up the project.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I desire to follow up very briefly the line of questioning which was conducted by my distinguished friend and deskmate, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] with reference to Wherry housing projects. The Senator knows this has been a matter of great concern and considerable study and work on the part of the Housing Subcommittee, of which I have the honor of being the chairman. The Senator will recall the exchange we had on the floor of the Senate at the time the bill was before the Senate for passage. Because of the language which had been arrived at and the legislative record which was made in connection with it, I thought we had established a rather fine understanding. Along with the Senator from Tennessee, I was disappointed to see the change which had taken place in conference, because, for one reason, I am not certain just what effect it will have.

I have followed the colloquy between the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Mississippi. I derive some reassurance from the interpretation the Senator from Mississippi has given to the language. Of course, all of the provision relates to condemnation. I rather feel we might accomplish something by directing our efforts toward having the Defense Department handle the matters, insofar as they can be handled, without condemnation.

As was stated when the bill was before the Senate for consideration, one of the great troubles has been the lack of uniformity. I am sure the Senator from Mississippi agrees with me in that statement, because he has said so before. Does he not?

Mr. STENNIS. Absolutely. We hope this additional legislative consideration of the problem will clear up some of the questions. We have tried to insist upon uniformity.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sorry I do not have the figures before me now, but I have had from time to time figures showing the progress made by the three different departments in the acquisition of the projects. The difference as to the manner in which the projects have been handled has been outstanding. The committee had in its report of the bill to the Senate a very fine statement. The Senator will remember I placed it in the RECORD at the time. It called upon the Secretary of Defense to take hold of this matter and to administer it in such a way as to bring about uniformity. The Senator from Mississippi is still of the mind that it ought to be done in that way, I am sure.

Mr. STENNIS. Certainly. I appreciate the Senator's emphasis. We made the language very strong for the record. I should like to read from that part of the report:

The committee expects the Secretary of Defense, who should now have no doubt about his authority, to establish a standard procedure which, in the interest of clarity, just compensation, and equitable treatment of all concerned, will be followed by the entire Department.

We expect to follow that up with a letter, emphasizing it even further, if that be possible.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am delighted to hear the Senator make that statement. This is one thing we should keep in mind. The Senator from Mississippi knows I never have liked the arrangement we have had with respect to Wherry housing. I did not like it as a program from the beginning.

I did not like the settlement which was made, yet I felt something had to be done. We wrote the provision into the law to require the armed services, before they build Capehart projects at locations where there are Wherry projects, particularly if the Wherry projects are not fully occupied, first to purchase the Wherry projects.

The point I wish to make is that we did so as a protection to the owners of the Wherry projects, against being put out of a profitable business by competition.

In any settlement under a forced condemnation certainly it seems to me full consideration should be given to the elements mentioned by the Senator from Tennessee. In other words, there should be kept foremost in the minds of the particular Department handling the negotiation the fact that the owner of the project ought to be treated fairly. That is all we ask for, and all we have ever asked for.

Mr. STENNIS. That is certainly our purpose. I think the Senator has made a very fine statement.

Mr. President, I wish to mention one additional point with reference to some of the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], in which he so clearly and aptly pointed out that the programs, which are authorized, to buy land and install sites for missiles, are only the forerunner of the actual shocking cost of the programs. Later they will involve personnel and all kinds of procurement for very, very expensive continued operations. These duplicating systems are already in being and are growing daily.

The appropriation bill which was approved on the floor only a few minutes ago, totalling a little less than \$40 billion, included approximately \$1½ billion with respect to the relatively small items we have been mentioning in the authorization bill, and they are not in full development yet. That shows unless some decisions are made at the level where these programs start, they will grow into billions of dollars in a very short time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a few moments?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am moved to make a brief additional comment with respect to the acquisition of Wherry projects, because of some of the things which have been said. I desire the RECORD to be clear that the members of the committee—all the members, including myself—want the negotiations for Wherry projects to be carried on fairly and expeditiously. We want the same principles to be applied whether the acquisition is in the name of the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Army, or the Secretary of the Air Force.

At the same time, Mr. President, I would not want a record to be written which I thought might be interpreted by anybody as requiring a consideration of the replacement costs of these projects, regardless of the factors involved. It certainly is true that the so-called Wherry housing projects represent a special situation. It is true that the normal elements of determining values in a condemnation proceeding may not be wholly applicable. It is true that the Government is the major client, and perhaps the only possible client for the use of the housing.

But, Mr. President, when these projects were provided for, it was recognized that a rather unusual situation existed, and the sponsors of the Wherry projects received consideration which is not normally given to builders. First, the sponsors of the Wherry projects received insured loans, and on a very liberal basis. In fact, memories are short in this country if we do not remember that some of those insured loans were later discovered to have exceeded the actual amount of the cost of the construction of the projects. Memories are short indeed if we do not remember that in some instances the insured loans exceeded by a very great deal the amount of money expended on the projects. Time was when we heard reports about the windfalls which were being realized by some of the sponsors of the Wherry projects, when they built the projects in the name of one corporation, which acquired the loan and promptly disposed of the project to a secondary corporation for securities, which would protect the loan so far as the earning requirements of the project were concerned, but which made it possible for a pretty substantial "melon" to be cut by the receivers of the proceeds of the loan.

A second thing I think we ought to remember is that the Wherry projects received practically a guaranty of rental clients. Very few builders of housing projects had customers provided for them in the same way the builders of these housing projects adjacent to military installations did.

Since the projects received the benefits of the insured loans and received the benefits of the rental clients, in the military personnel who were provided to rent the projects, I think these projects should not come under a yardstick of replacement cost, by which the cost to the Government should be measured if the Government is to acquire the projects. In many instances the replace-

ment cost today at a military installation would be a cost abnormally high because of the presence of the military installation.

Must the Government provide the money to build the housing project, provide the rental clients, then build up the military installation in the community until there is an abnormally high wage cost and construction cost in the area, and then, when the Government is to acquire the project, pay for the inflated costs which are the results of the Government's own activity or its beneficence? I am one Senator who thinks that the Government should not be required to make its repayment on any such basis.

I am wholly in agreement with the Senator from Alabama, the Senator from Tennessee, and the Senator from Mississippi in saying we want the owners of Wherry housing projects to be treated fairly and we want the properties to be acquired expeditiously, but we think the fairness rule should work both ways. The settlement should be fair to the Government as well as fair to the sponsor or owner of the project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

POISONED SEED WHEAT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 666) to remove wheat for seeding purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances from the unfit for human consumption category for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the pending business before the Senate is S. 666?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is S. 666.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, there is a bill on the calendar, that was passed by the House, which is almost identical to the Senate bill, with technical changes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 666 be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2250, H. R. 11581.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11581) to remove wheat for seeding purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances from the unit for human consumption category for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the bill is nearly identical to S. 666, Calendar No. 1431, except that there has been incorporated in the committee amendment to S. 666 an additional technical amendment suggested by the Department of Agriculture.

The bill provides that wheat for seed purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances or otherwise made unfit for human consumption shall be classified as "wheat" rather than "wheat, unfit for human consumption" for the purpose of import quotas and duties.

Mr. President, so far we have had three classifications of wheat imports. This bill would not touch any one of those 3 classifications, which include a quota limitation of 800,000 bushels, which has been in effect since 1941.

There is another classification of wheat, consisting of the poorer grades of imported wheat deemed to be unfit for human consumption, and used largely for feed purposes. These imports last year were about 6 million bushels, and they have reached as much as 30 million bushels. This bill does not touch that classification.

There is still another classification of wheat under the Federal Seed Act. This bill does not change that classification.

Recently there has been discovered a loophole in our import laws whereby a foreign country can treat wheat with poisonous substances for the prevention of smut and other diseases, and then label it "unfit for human consumption." By doing this, they are able to get by our import duties. They pay only a 5-percent ad valorem duty on that classification of wheat. Otherwise, they would have to pay 21 cents a bushel.

There are only about 2 million bushels or less coming into the United States under this classification. That is a small amount, when we consider that we shall probably have a surplus of 2 billion bushels, and the Canadian surplus will probably be 1 billion bushels.

The main purpose of the bill is to protect the seed industry of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 666 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 666 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, excerpts from the report of the House Committee on Agriculture, which I believe gives an excellent explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the House report (No. 2317) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURCHASE OF FLOUR AND CORNMEAL FOR DONATION PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to permit the Commodity Credit Corporation, when it deems it advisable, to purchase flour and cornmeal for donation purposes, rather than entering into a contract to have flour and cornmeal milled from grain in the CCC inventory. It also authorizes CCC to sell an

equivalent amount of wheat and corn to offset purchases of flour and cornmeal.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

The need for the legislation is described in some detail in the executive communication from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture to the Speaker of the House of Representatives which transmitted the draft of this bill and recommended its enactment.

The Department of Agriculture estimates that there would probably be a saving in cost of carrying out the programs involved as the result of the enactment of this bill.

TRADE AND DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL

Approval of the grain trades and other interested parties was indicated at hearings held on this bill and on an identical bill, H. R. 12555, by Mr. Quile. The committee knows of no opposition to the bill. Approval of the Department of Agriculture is indicated in the following executive communication:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1958.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is attached herewith for the consideration of the Congress a draft of a bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase wheat flour and cornmeal and donate the same to designated domestic and foreign outlets.

Pursuant to authority provided in section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, CCC is currently making wheat flour and cornmeal processed from its stocks of wheat and corn available for donation in the United States to school-lunch programs, needy persons, charitable institutions, and to nonprofit voluntary agencies for assistance to needy persons outside the United States. The program making wheat flour and cornmeal available for donation under section 416 was initiated following passage of Public Law 540, 4th Congress (sec. 212), which authorized CCC to pay the cost of processing its commodities into a form suitable for home or institutional use.

In the last 12 months, November 1956 through October 1957, an average of approximately 85 million pounds of flour and 34 million pounds of cornmeal were processed each month. During this period, a total of 780 contracts were entered into with 72 flour mills located in 28 States and 35 cornmeal mills located in 17 States. Distribution of the products was made to domestic donation outlets in all 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and to nonprofit voluntary welfare agencies at east, gulf, west coast, and Great Lakes ports for export to needy persons in foreign countries.

CCC enters into foreign contracts with commercial millers to process the CCC wheat and corn into flour and cornmeal, the miller retaining the byproducts, under a competitive-bidding procedure. CCC ships wheat and corn from storage to the contractor mills and arranges for delivery of the processed flour and cornmeal from the mills to the recipient agencies. Contracts awarded to millers by CCC are made on the basis that delivery of the flour and cornmeal to the delivery point specified by the consignee will result in the lowest possible cost to CCC.

Our experience in administering the donation program for wheat flour and cornmeal on the present basis indicates that the changes which the proposed legislation would make possible are desirable.

It is not unusual under our present program to receive 100 bids in response to a single bid solicitation. It is, in many instances, impracticable, if not impossible, to satisfactorily determine which bids will result in the lowest cost to the Government, because of the many intangible factors which must be considered in making the thousands of comparative costing evaluations which are involved. The evaluation of bids cannot be limited to a comparative price analysis of the cost of milling the grain into the finished

product, but must include the cost of transporting the CCC grain from the multiplicity of storage locations to the mill, the cost of transporting the milled product from the mill to destination points within all of the 48 States, the east, gulf, west coast, and Great Lakes ports in such a manner as will best utilize in-transit benefits, and the determination of the market value of the byproducts which are retained by the miller. Considerable man-hours and administrative costs are devoted to this effort.

The requirement that flour and cornmeal made available under the donation programs must be milled from CCC stocks of grain places millers located in certain areas of the United States, not contiguous to the terminal and subterminal areas where CCC generally has its grain stored, at a competitive disadvantage with other millers because of the higher freight costs involved. In their usual commercial transactions, this disadvantage tends to be equalized by the benefit of the lower market value of wheat and corn at their locations, but it is incapable of being realized under our present program, which requires that the grain to be milled must come from CCC stocks.

The proposed drafted bill, if enacted, would authorize CCC to purchase flour and cornmeal from millers on a competitive f. o. b. consignee delivery point basis. This would enable millers to obtain their stocks of wheat and corn through their usual marketing channels, which should assist in stabilizing domestic prices of wheat and corn by stimulating movement of wheat and corn from the producer into usual channels of trade. It would, further, make it possible for those millers who are not now in a position to compete favorably with other millers because of location of their mill in relation to storage location of CCC wheat and corn to obtain their fair share of this business.

It is not possible to accurately assess the direct effect the proposed bill would have on CCC holdings of wheat and corn; however, we are of the opinion that quantities of wheat and corn purchased by millers in the open market to meet the flour and cornmeal requirements of the donation programs will, in large part, be offset by a compensating reduction in the quantity of those grains which CCC takes into inventory under the price-support programs. The proposed bill provides that an amount of wheat and corn equal to the amount processed to deliver the flour and cornmeal may be sold to commercial millers or others at domestic market prices. This provision will enable millers to obtain wheat or corn from CCC to meet the requirements of this program, if they so desire. The provisions will be made a requirement of specific flour and cornmeal contracts in the event it is determined by CCC that certain stocks of wheat or corn in inventory should be disposed of under this program because of their age, location, condition, or general storage characteristics.

Enactment of the proposed bill would make possible a program which would place all flour and cornmeal millers on a more equal competitive basis and could be administered more equitably and effectively. The time required to carry out this program would be reduced, and savings are possible. The exact amount, however, is very difficult to determine since the program is closely associated with other similar 416 programs.

A similar draft of legislation has been submitted to the President of the Senate.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report and draft of the proposed bill attached thereto.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. PETERSON, Acting Secretary.

OTHER PROCESSING

The committee hopes that, in addition to the objectives it seeks in this legislation, as presented in the foregoing executive communication (and in hearings on the bill),

enactment of the bill will simplify and facilitate disposal of wheat and corn.

Commodity Credit Corporation inventories of wheat have not diminished since the enactment of Public Law 480 in July 1954, and inventories of corn have more than tripled, despite the operations of the past 2 years of the soil bank and Public Law 480. Forecasts indicate a bumper corn crop and a near record wheat crop for this year. Cumulative storage costs continue to mount on these and other commodities, at approximately \$1 million a day.

The committee urges the Department to reexamine its policies and procedures to ascertain whether increased exports of these abundant commodities may not be achieved. A full study of the practicability of processing wheat into bulgar wheat and corn into corn sirup or oil might disclose opportunities for additional disposal abroad, not only under title III but under other programs, with a net saving to CCC, as compared to losses from spoilage and cumulative storage costs.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

While the bill reported herewith does not make any direct amendment of existing law, it does modify the Department of Agriculture's authority with respect to sections 407 and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, section 210 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, and title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. The relevant portions of these three acts are set out below as exhibits A, B, and C.

EXHIBIT A

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

RESTRICTIONS ON SALES BY CCC

SEC. 407. The Commodity Credit Corporation may sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at any price not prohibited by this section. In determining sales policies for basic agricultural commodities or storable nonbasic commodities, the Corporation should give consideration to the establishing of such policies with respect to prices, terms, and conditions as it determines will not discourage or deter manufacturers, processors, and dealers from acquiring and carrying normal inventories of the commodity of the current crop. The Corporation shall not sell any basic agricultural commodity or storable nonbasic commodity at less than 5 percent above the current support price for such commodity, plus reasonable carrying charges. The foregoing restrictions shall not apply to (A) sales for new or byproduct uses; (B) sales of peanuts and oilseeds for the extraction of oil; (C) sales for seed or feed if such sales will not substantially impair any price-support program; (D) sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or as to which there is a danger of loss or waste through deterioration or spoilage; (E) sales for the purpose of establishing claims arising out of contract or against persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentation, or other wrongful acts with respect to the commodity; (F) sales for export; (G) sales of wool; and (H) sales for other than primary uses. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Corporation, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem in the public interest, shall make available any farm commodity or product thereof owned or controlled by it for use in relieving distress (1) in any area in the United States declared by the President to be an acute distress area because of unemployment or other economic cause if the President finds that such use will not displace or interfere with normal marketing of agricultural commodities, and (2) in connection with any major disaster determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1855). Except on a reimbursable basis, the Corporation shall not bear any costs in connection with making

Public Law 85-685
85th Congress, H. R. 13015
August 20, 1958

AN ACT

72 Stat. 636.

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Military
Construction
Act of 1958.
Army.

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,697,000.

Detroit Arsenal, Michigan: Administrative facilities, \$5,666,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$8,529,000.

Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois: Operational and training facilities, \$570,000.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, research, development and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$7,931,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$4,630,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Army Chemical Center, Maryland: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Troop housing, \$795,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$9,098,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Army Map Service, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, \$1,913,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,634,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Troop housing, \$862,000.

FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, \$171,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Troop housing and utilities, \$3,749,000.

(Second Army Area)

Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: Hospital facilities, family housing, and real estate, \$2,274,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$516,000.

Fort Meade, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, \$498,000.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Supply facilities, \$43,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and family housing, \$3,454,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$762,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and administrative facilities, \$847,000.

Fort McClellan, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, and hospital facilities, \$3,505,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,406,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$13,734,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,258,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$3,227,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Troop housing, and family housing, \$783,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,076,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,084,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Camp Desert Rock, Nevada: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$374,000.

Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,085,000.

Fort Ord, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,733,000.

Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, \$173,000.

(Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Troop housing, medical facilities, and community facilities, \$5,844,000.

(Armed Forces Special Weapons)

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$273,000.

(Tactical Installations Support Facilities)

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, \$6,311,000.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(Alaskan Area)

Fairbanks Permafrost Research Area: Real estate, \$7,000.

(Pacific Command Area)

Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, \$240,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Troop housing, \$593,000.

Fort Shafter, Hawaii: Supply facilities, maintenance facilities, family housing, and community facilities, \$2,925,000.

Korea: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$904,000.

(United States Army, Europe)

France: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,063,000.

SEC. 102. Subject to the provisions of Section 402 hereof, the Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities, including those for defense missiles, by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$173,678,000.

Classified installations and facilities.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$17,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

Construction for unforeseen requirements.

Report to Congressional committees.

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, and subject to the provisions of section 513 of this Act, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise,

Family housing.
5 USC 1712-1.

7 USC 1691
note.

12 USC 1748a-
1748g, 42 USC
1594-1594f.

family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 298 units.

Vicenza, Italy, 371 units.

Army Security Agency, location 13, 91 units.

Gateway Communications Station, 174 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, 316 units.

Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York, 120 units.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, 200 units.

Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, 130 units.

Fort Lee, Virginia, 435 units.

Natick R&E, Massachusetts, 35 units.

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, 618 units.

Two Rock Ranch Station, California, 25 units.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 50 units.

Baumont Army Hospital, Texas, 125 units.

Fort Totten, New York, 130 units.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky, 837 units.

Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois, 65 units.

Fort Rucker, Alabama, 400 units.

Fort Stewart, Georgia, 73 units.

Fort Bliss, Texas, 410 units.

Fort Hood, Texas, 500 units.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma, 349 units.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, 700 units.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, 200 units.

Fort Sheridan, Illinois, 50 units.

Forts Baker and Barry, California, 98 units.

Oakland Army Terminal, California, 88 units.

Fort Lewis, Washington, 856 units.

Branch United States Disciplinary Barracks, California, 160 units.

United States Military Academy, New York, 156 units.

Bossier Base, Louisiana, 200 units.

Medina Base, Texas, 125 units.

Sandia Base, New Mexico, 213 units.

Army Air Defense Command Stations, 466 units.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Canal Zone, 330 units.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, 385 units.

Fort Shafter, Hawaii, 481 units: *Provided, however,* That no family housing units shall be constructed on Fort DeRussy.

(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Aberdeen, Maryland, 796 units.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 400 units.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas, 840 units.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma, 500 units.

Family housing.
42 USC 1594a.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

67 Stat. 440.

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICE FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Pueblo Ordnance Depot, Colorado, strike out "\$563,000" and insert in place thereof "\$600,000".

(b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$44,407,000" and "\$134,075,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$44,444,000" and "\$134,112,000", respectively.

67 Stat. 451.

SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

69 Stat. 324.

(1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, strike out "\$2,865,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,180,000".

(2) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, strike out "\$615,000" and insert in place thereof "\$731,000"; and with respect to Vint Hill Farms Station, Virginia, strike out "\$695,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,022,000".

(3) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Corps of Engineers)", with respect to Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois, strike out "\$1,822,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,815,000".

(4) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Medical Corps)", with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, strike out "\$4,472,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,714,000".

(5) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Second Army Area)", with respect to Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, strike out "\$923,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,264,000".

(6) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fourth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas, strike out "\$4,645,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,965,000"; and with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike out "\$3,053,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,454,000".

(7) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Sixth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Ord, California, strike out "\$1,407,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,742,000".

(8) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Military Academy)", with respect to the United States Military Academy, New York, strike out "\$756,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,171,000".

(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$237,320,000" and "\$546,387,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$244,125,000" and "\$553,192,000", respectively.

67 Stat. 451.

SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

70 Stat. 991.

(1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico, strike out "\$693,000" and insert in place thereof "\$735,000".

(2) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Chemical Corps)", with respect to Camp Detrick, Maryland, strike out "\$913,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,074,000"; and with respect to Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, strike out "\$867,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,044,000".

(3) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, strike out "\$6,856,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,576,000".

(4) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Corps of Engineers)", with respect to Fort Belvoir, Virginia, strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$940,000".

(5) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Transportation Corps)", with respect to Fort Eustis, Virginia, strike out "\$1,231,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,436,000".

(6) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (First Army Area)", with respect to Fort Dix, New Jersey, strike out "\$54,000" and insert in place thereof "\$68,000".

(7) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Second Army Area)", with respect to Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, strike out "\$5,885,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,695,000".

(8) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Third Army Area)", with respect to Fort Benning, Georgia, strike out "\$422,000" and insert in place thereof "\$616,000"; and with respect to Fort McClellan, Alabama, strike out "\$397,000" and insert in place thereof "\$527,000".

(9) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fourth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Hood, Texas, strike out "\$2,457,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,846,000".

(10) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Riley, Kansas, strike out "\$1,519,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,892,000".

(11) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Sixth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Lewis, Washington, strike out "\$3,022,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,596,000"; and with respect to Fort Ord, California, strike out "\$223,000" and insert in place thereof "\$319,000".

70 Stat. 991.

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

Under the subheading "(Alaskan Area)", with respect to Wildwood Station (Kenai), strike out "\$352,000" and insert in place thereof "\$516,000".

70 Stat. 1015.

(c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 402 the amounts "\$95,010,000", "\$35,763,000", and "\$334,104,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$100,343,000", "\$35,927,000", and "\$339,601,000", respectively.

71 Stat. 531.

SEC. 108. (a) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101 follows:

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Corps of Engineers)", with respect to Cold Regions Laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire, strike out "\$2,496,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,787,000".

71 Stat. 557.

(b) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$115,624,000" and "\$293,103,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$116,915,000" and "\$294,394,000".

San Jacinto
Ordnance Depot,
Tex. Conveyance.

SEC. 109. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed, unless the Secretary of Defense finds after due investigation that such action would be inimical to the national security, to make available to the Administrator of the General Services Administration, or his designee, the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Texas. Upon such property being made available, the Administrator or his designee is authorized and directed to enter into a contract or contracts for the

sale of such property in lots or in its entirety under public bid procedures and at not less than the fair market value and to convey by quitclaim deed, all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this Act, in and to such property to any legal person or group except Government agencies or departments upon such terms and conditions as the Administrator or his designee determines to be in the public interest.

(b) Any conveyance made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) hereof shall include the following conditions: Conditions.

(1) All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands to be conveyed shall be reserved to the United States;

(2) The San Jacinto property shall be offered for sale within twenty-four months from the date of enactment of this Act;

(3) Title in and to such property shall remain in the United States until full payment of the agreed purchase price is made.

(c) In the event the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot is made available to the General Services Administration pursuant to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) hereof, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Army such sums as are necessary not to exceed \$40,000,000 to establish and construct, including land acquisition, replacement facilities to the extent required at Point-Aux-Pins, Alabama, or any other location selected by the Secretary of Defense. Point-Aux-Pins, Ala.
Appropriation,
etc.

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to modify the requirements of section 2662 of title 10 of the United States Code relative to coming into agreement with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to real estate actions. 70A Stat. 147.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects: Navy.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Facility, Cape May, New Jersey: Operational and training facilities, \$141,000.

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Drydock, design, plans and engineering studies preliminary to initiation of construction, \$500,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Operational and training facilities, \$6,000,000: *Provided, however,* That no more than \$500,000 of this sum shall be utilized for protective works until the Secretary of the Navy determines in his judgment that sufficient action has been taken or arrangements made to arrest further subsidence of the shipyard.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Operational and training facilities, \$2,247,000.

Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California: Operational and training facilities, \$766,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,709,000.

Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$2,546,000.

(Naval Air Training Stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Troop housing, \$1,041,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$14,940,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$4,679,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational and training facilities, \$114,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Maintenance facilities, \$1,252,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, California: Operational and training facilities, \$47,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Operational and training facilities, \$80,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Fentress, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, administrative facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$11,215,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational and training facilities, \$74,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$15,823,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$9,892,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, and real estate, \$7,000,000.

Naval Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities and real estate, \$4,352,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational and training facilities and real estate, \$8,946,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,067,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, \$1,003,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Operational and training facilities, \$2,158,000.

(Special Purpose Air Stations)

Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing,

utilities, and operational and training facilities at the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland, \$17,666,000.

Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing (including operational and training facilities and troop housing on San Nicolas Island; and maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements at Camp Cooke), \$13,841,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Depot, Newport, Rhode Island: Utilities, \$2,210,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Administrative facilities, \$128,000.

Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California: Administrative facilities, \$146,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Operational and training facilities, \$280,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Utilities, \$462,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,138,000.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$168,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California: Utilities, \$206,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Maintenance facilities, \$241,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California: Supply facilities, \$129,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord, California: Maintenance facilities, \$2,517,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, California: Research, development, and test facilities, \$510,000.

Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Virginia: Research, development, and test facilities, \$44,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Hingham, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, \$694,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, \$601,000.

SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Troop housing, \$14,200,000.

Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$1,184,000.

Naval Receiving Station, District of Columbia: Operational facilities, \$650,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Operational and training facilities, \$1,368,000.

Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational and training facilities, \$273,000.

Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$4,643,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Operational and training facilities, \$4,199,000.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland: Hospital and medical facilities, \$8,503,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational and training facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$38,654,000.

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development, and test facilities, \$192,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, \$159,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

Naval Air Station, Agana, Mariana Islands: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$4,414,000.

Naval Station, Bermuda, British West Indies: Operational and training facilities, \$683,000.

Naval Air Station, Ford Island, Territory of Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, \$1,271,000.

Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Supply facilities, \$165,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, \$3,824,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Supply Depot, Guam, Mariana Islands: Supply facilities, \$3,060,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Communication Unit Number Three, Asmara, Eritrea: Operational and training facilities, \$1,180,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Operational and training facilities, \$219,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Port Lyautey, Morocco: Operational and training facilities, \$519,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$890,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, con-

verting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$75,301,000.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop naval installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$17,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

Construction for unforeseen requirements.

Report to Congressional committees.

SEC. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, and subject to the provisions of section 513 of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Family housing.
5 USC 1712-1.

7 USC 1691 note.

Naval Magazine, Cartagena, Spain, 46 units, and community facilities.

Naval Magazine, El Ferrol, Spain, 45 units, and community facilities.

Naval Air Station, Port Lyautey, Morocco, 330 units.

Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Italy, 122 units, and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

12 USC 1748a-1748g, 42 USC 1594-1594f.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, 277 units.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, 800 units.

Naval Facility, Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, 27 units.

Naval Facility, Centerville, California, 24 units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, 849 units.

Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oregon, 24 units.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, 425 units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 800 units.

Naval Facility, Nantucket, Massachusetts, 19 units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 500 units.

Naval Facility, Pacific Beach, Washington, 30 units.

Naval Facility, Point Sur, California, 24 units.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, 550 units.

Naval Ordnance Missile Test Facility, White Sands Proving Grounds, New Mexico, 51 units.

Naval Base, San Diego, California, 1,000 units, to be constructed on land, including the following tracts which are hereby authorized and directed to be transferred to the Department of the Navy by the Administrator of General Services without reimbursement: GSA H-Cal 546B; and GSA H-Cal 587.

OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES

Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 1,140 units.

Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, Headquarters, Camp H. M. Smith, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 168 units.

Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands, 220 units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 650 units.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 80 units.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, 650 units.

42 USC 1594a.

(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, 1,562 units.

Marine Corps Training Center, Twentynine Palms, California, 493 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, 96 units.

Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Maryland, 385 units.

Naval Station, Green Cove Springs, Florida, 392 units.

Squantum Gardens, Massachusetts, 150 units.

66 Stat. 609.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "MEDICAL FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Virginia Area, strike out "\$12,815,000" and insert in place thereof "\$13,979,000".

66 Stat. 625.

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$139,143,000" and "\$266,927,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$140,307,000", and "\$268,091,000".

66 Stat. 613.

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "\$70,656,000", and inserting in place thereof "\$72,785,000".

68 Stat. 561.

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$70,656,000", and "\$210,704,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$72,785,000", and "\$212,833,000".

69 Stat. 333.

SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "MARINE CORPS FACILITIES", with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, strike out "\$648,000" and insert in place thereof "\$778,000".

(2) Under the subheading "ORDNANCE FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Underwater Ordnance Station, Newport, Rhode Island, strike out "\$370,000" and insert in place thereof "\$411,000".

69 Stat. 335.

(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

Under subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands, by striking out "\$6,525,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$9,063,000" and with respect to the Naval Station, Argentina, Newfoundland, by striking out "\$8,589,800" and inserting in place thereof "\$9,089,800".

(c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$308,463,600", "\$108,365,300", and "\$575,592,300" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$308,634,600", "\$111,403,300", and "\$578,801,300". 70 Stat. 1002.

SEC. 208. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows: 70 Stat. 994.

(1) Under the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island, strike out "\$11,672,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,601,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Naval Air Training Stations)", with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas, strike out "\$2,247,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,569,000"; and with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, strike out "\$8,231,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,141,000".

(3) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Marine Corps Air Stations)", with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, strike out "\$170,000" and insert in place thereof "\$273,000".

(4) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES", with respect to the Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia, strike out "\$237,000" and insert in place thereof "\$300,000", and with respect to the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, strike out "\$8,413,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,613,000".

(5) Under the subheading "MEDICAL FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Illinois, strike out "\$12,730,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,754,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 203 "\$85,939,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$86,711,000". 70 Stat. 1000.

(c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$303,453,000", "\$85,939,000", and "\$451,393,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$312,004,000", "\$86,711,000", and "\$460,716,000". 70 Stat. 1015.

SEC. 209. Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows: 71 Stat. 538.

Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, insert before "\$7,669,000" the words "and land acquisition."

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects: Air Force.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$2,649,000.

Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Troop housing, \$990,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$10,659,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,176,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$10,673,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Community facilities, and utilities, \$229,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, \$9,948,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$935,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,721,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and utilities, \$3,689,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Medical facilities, \$122,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and real estate, \$2,799,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,579,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Troop housing, and ground improvements, \$795,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$3,992,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$8,696,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$975,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$1,177,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,746,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Utilities, \$157,000.

Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania: Supply facilities, \$94,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, \$1,560,000.

Memphis General Depot, Memphis, Tennessee: Administrative facilities, \$1,464,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California: Supply facilities, \$658,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$6,169,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,362,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$5,196,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, \$11,037,000.

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, \$981,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$10,109,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$1,650,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$481,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, \$165,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,884,000.

SCHOOL OF AVIATION MEDICINE

School of Aviation Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, \$12,000,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$979,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$1,584,000.

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Troop housing, \$640,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Troop housing, \$400,000.

Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$208,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Troop housing, \$750,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$441,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,213,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, \$2,119,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, troop housing and utilities, \$5,432,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Maintenance facilities, \$358,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Maintenance facilities, \$319,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$245,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$571,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,770,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$3,081,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,361,000.

CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Troop housing, \$1,805,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$11,589,000.

Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Utilities, \$172,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$18,937,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, \$78,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$2,874,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,901,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Troop housing, \$423,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,051,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,280,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,868,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,080,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,654,000.

Brunswick Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$11,417,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,996,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$2,257,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$4,183,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,734,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,939,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,174,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,404,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,346,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,931,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$4,094,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,703,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,489,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,493,000.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$3,401,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,795,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$897,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,250,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,463,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$11,716,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$3,774,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,577,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,832,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$3,344,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,137,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$1,039,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$3,265,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$940,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$208,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$15,552,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,352,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,997,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$8,431,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Troop housing, \$945,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,185,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Maintenance facilities, \$536,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,371,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,650,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Troop housing, \$591,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,707,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,339,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,474,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$563,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$169,833,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Various locations: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$696,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, \$380,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, \$710,000.

King Salmon Airport: Operational and training facilities, \$340,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$24,986,000.

CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and training facilities, \$1,540,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$5,347,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$144,000.

Midway Island: Supply facilities, \$839,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$15,688,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,508,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$643,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$21,431,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$19,952,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$29,135,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$315,000.

Classified in-
stallations and
facilities.

SEC. 302. Subject to the provisions of Section 402 hereof, the Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic, strategic, and defense missiles by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$269,100,000.

Construction
for unforeseen
requirements.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$17,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

Report to
Congressional
committees.

Family housing.
5 USC 1712-1.

SEC. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, and subject to the provisions of section 513 of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

7 USC 1691 note.

Lajes Field, Azores, 306 units.
Kindley Air Force Base, Bermuda, 300 units.
Laon, France, 102 units.
Keflavik Airport, Iceland, 300 units.
Benguerir Airport, Morocco, 248 units.
Sidi Slimane Air Base, Morocco, 295 units.
Clark Air Force Base, Philippines, 900 units.
Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, 200 units.
Madrid-Torrejon area, Spain, 460 units.
Moron-San Pablo area, Spain, 40 units.
Various locations, Spain, 120 units, and community facilities.

Zaragoza Air Base, Spain, 176 units.

Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 50 units.

Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 190 units.

Bruntingthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 93 units.

Brize Norton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 215 units.

Chelveston RAF Station, United Kingdom, 79 units.

Chicksands Priory RAF Station, United Kingdom, 83 units.

Fairford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 177 units.

High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 110 units.

Lakenheath-Mildenhall Area, United Kingdom, 55 units, and community facilities.

Stansted-Mountfitchet RAF Station, United Kingdom, 22 units.

Upper Heyford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 259 units.

Wethersfield RAF Station, United Kingdom, 416 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

12 USC 1748a-1748g, 42 USC 1594-1594f.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Camp Adair Air Force Station, Oregon, 150 units.

Amarillo Air Force Base, Texas, 500 units.

Beale Air Force Base, California, 970 units.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, 250 units.

Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, 450 units.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 536 units.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 50 units.

Custer Air Force Station, Michigan, 169 units.

Donaldson Air Force Base, South Carolina, 275 units.

Cooke Air Force Base, California, 525 units.

Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, 500 units.

Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 530 units.

Duluth Municipal Airport, Minnesota, 365 units.

Edwards Air Force Base, California, 778 units.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, 220 units.

Forbes Air Force Base, Kansas, 414 units.

Fort Lee Air Force Station, Virginia, 154 units.

Geiger Field, Washington, 168 units.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 460 units.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, 744 units.

Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, 270 units.

Hamilton Air Force Base, California, 550 units.

Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, 400 units.

James Connally Air Force Base, Texas, 366 units.

Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, 290 units.

Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan, 475 units.

K. I. Sawyer Airport, Michigan, 595 units.

Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, 490 units.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, Louisiana, 300 units.

Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, 500 units.

Larson Air Force Base, Washington, 200 units.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio, 400 units.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, 150 units.

Mather Air Force Base, California, 220 units.

McChord Air Force Base, Washington, 1,000 units.

McClellan Air Force Base, California, 540 units.

McCoy Air Force Base, Florida, 668 units.

McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, 1,450 units.

Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 932 units.
 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 270 units.
 Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, 200 units.
 Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, New York, 290 units.
 Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 616 units.
 Onnard Air Force Base, California, 315 units.
 Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, 483 units.
 Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.
 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wisconsin, 900 units.
 Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Missouri, 610 units.
 Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, 150 units.
 Selfridge Air Force Base, Michigan, 580 units.
 Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas, 500 units.
 Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa, 235 units.
 Stewart Air Force Base, New York, 300 units.
 Suffolk County Air Force Base, New York, 220 units.
 Syracuse Air Force Station, New York, 216 units.
 Topsham Air Force Station, Maine, 177 units.
 Truax Field, Wisconsin, 280 units.
 Turner Air Force Base, Georgia, 200 units.
 United States Air Force Academy, Colorado, 300 units.
 Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 230 units.
 Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts, 310 units.
 Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, 154 units.
 Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, 150 units.
 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 618 units.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, 1,050 units.
 Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, 600 units.

Family housing.
 42 USC 1594a.

(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:

Brookley Air Force Base, Alabama, 175 units.
 Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, 600 units.
 Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, 225 units.
 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, 550 units.
 Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, 500 units.
 Hunter Air Force Base, Georgia, 500 units.
 Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, 592 units.
 Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, 480 units.
 March Air Force Base, California, 644 units.
 Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, 250 units.
 Mitchel Air Force Base, New York, 628 units.
 Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, 612 units.
 Reese Air Force Base, Texas, 418 units.
 Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, 400 units.
 Walker Air Force Base, New Mexico, 800 units.
 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, 2,000 units.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301 as follows:

69 Stat. 338.

Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND", with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts, strike out "\$6,076,000", and insert in place thereof "\$6,522,000".

69 Stat. 340.

Under the subheading "AIR MATERIAL COMMAND", with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out "\$14,508,000" and insert in place thereof "\$15,800,000".

(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is 69 Stat. 350. amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "\$824,300,000" and "\$1,363,189,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$826,038,000" and "\$1,364,927,000", respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

70 Stat. 1002.

Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota, strike out "\$1,469,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,636,000".

(2) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts, strike out "\$11,577,000" and insert in place thereof "\$13,341,000".

Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND", with respect to Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, strike out "\$1,339,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,661,000".

Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND", with respect to James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas, strike out "\$4,687,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,301,000".

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out, "\$1,586,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,726,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the amounts 70 Stat. 1015. "\$811,342,000" and "\$1,447,950,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$814,349,000" and "\$1,450,957,000", respectively.

SEC. 307. (a) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as 71 Stat. 543. follows:

Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana, strike out "\$2,048,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,390,000".

(2) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri, strike out "\$1,100,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,348,000".

(3) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out "\$6,804,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,507,000".

(4) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts, strike out "\$559,000" and insert in place thereof "\$615,000".

Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND", with respect to Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, strike out "\$899,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,128,000".

Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND", with respect to Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas, strike out "\$460,000" and insert in place thereof "\$637,000".

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana, strike out "\$3,344,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,633,000".

(2) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California, strike out "\$7,458,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,087,000".

(3) with respect to MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida, strike out "\$936,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,268,000".

(4) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out "\$2,344,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,947,000".

(5) with respect to Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri, strike out "\$235,000" and insert in place thereof "\$306,000".

71 Stat. 557.

(b) Public Law 85-241, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "\$394,076,000" and "\$601,781,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$399,755,000" and "\$607,460,000", respectively.

Ante, p. 11.

SEC. 308. (a) Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended, under the heading "ALERT AND DISPERSAL OF STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND FORCES" in section 1, as follows:

(1) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out "\$895,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,892,000".

(2) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out "\$867,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,479,000".

(3) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out "\$4,380,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,479,000".

(4) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "\$690,000" and insert in place thereof "\$969,000".

Ante, p. 11.

(b) Public Law 85-325, Eighty-fifth Congress, is amended by striking out in section 3 the amount "\$549,670,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$552,657,000".

10 USC app.
1857.

SEC. 309. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure "\$135,425,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure "\$139,797,000".

SEC. 310. The last paragraph under the heading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND" in title III of Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress (69 Stat. 342), is amended to read as follows:

"Various Locations: Research, development, and operational facilities (including not more than \$357,000 for an off-base roadway approximately ten miles in length in the vicinity of the north boundary of Cape Canaveral—an auxiliary to Patrick Air Force Base) \$20,000,000."

Effective date.

The amendment made by this section is effective from March 1, 1956.

TITLE IV

Advanced re-
search projects.
Appropriation.

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities required for advanced research projects and in connection therewith may acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000.

Determination
of missile type.

SEC. 402. The Secretary of Defense or his designee shall, prior to the utilization of the funds authorized by Sections 102 and 302 of this Act for establishing or developing classified military installations and facilities for defense missiles by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force, respectively, determine with respect to each defended area, which missile or combination of missiles will be employed in that area. In making such determination, the Secretary of Defense shall have the authority to transfer such funds as may be made available pursuant to the authorizations contained in such sections for such installations and facilities, to the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, to enable such

Transfer of
funds.

Secretaries to utilize the authority contained in such sections in accordance with such determinations.

SEC. 403. The Secretary of Defense shall report in detail semi-annually to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to the exercise of the authority granted by this title. Report to Congress.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 529, 40 U. S. C. 259, 267), and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise. Land improvements, etc.
70A Stat. 269, 590.

SEC. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations, for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed— Appropriation.

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$109,556,000; outside the United States, \$8,732,000; section 102, \$173,678,000; section 103, \$17,500,000; or a total of \$309,466,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$216,809,000; outside the United States, \$16,384,000; section 202, \$75,301,000; section 203, \$17,500,000; or a total of \$325,994,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$542,161,000; outside the United States, \$123,654,000; section 302, \$269,100,000; section 303, \$17,500,000; or a total of \$952,415,000.

(4) for title IV: \$50,000,000.

SEC. 503. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title. Cost variations.

SEC. 504. Any outstanding authority heretofore provided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991), for the provision of family housing shall be available for the construction of family housing at any installations for which appropriated fund family housing is authorized to be constructed under titles I and III of this Act. Family housing.

SEC. 505. Whenever— Contracts.

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and 70A Stat. 132.

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those

contracts; the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 506. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States, its territories and possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another Department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and section 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547, 551). The Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 507. As of July 1, 1959, all authorization for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 4, 1956, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1959, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) the authorizations for public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in sections 2231-2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886);

(5) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$30,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(6) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

(7) the authorization for public works and for the appropriation of funds that are contained in the Act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended; and

(8) notwithstanding the provision of section 506 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 558), the authorization for:

(a) jet engine test cells in the amount of \$1,850,000 at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia, that is contained in title II, section 201 under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" of the Act of August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 440, 442), as amended;

(b) ammunition storage facilities in the amount of \$225,000 at the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California; navigational aids in the amount of \$590,000 at

70A Stat. 127.

41 USC 152.

Report to
Congress.

Repeals.

Exoeptions.

70A Stat. 120-
123.

64 Stat. 830, 831.

the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California; research and development facilities in the amount of \$1,804,000 at the Naval Air Turbine Test Station, Trenton, New Jersey; and navigational aids in the amount of \$400,000 at the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: that are contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 540), as amended;

(c) the development of aviation ordnance facilities in the amount of \$2,638,000 that is contained in title II, section 202, of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 543), as amended.

SEC. 508. Section 408 (b) of the Act of June 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 236, 245), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 509. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1958 through and including 1961, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than five thousand of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit."

Housing
facilities.
Lease.

SEC. 510. Section 406 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1015), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of a military department may acquire any interest in land that—

Acquisition
of land.

"(1) he or his designee determines is needed in the interest of national defense; and

"(2) does not cost more than \$25,000 (exclusive of administrative costs and the amounts of any deficiency judgments).

This section does not authorize the acquisition, as part of the same project, of two or more contiguous parcels of land that together cost more than \$25,000."

SEC. 511. Section 408 (a) of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

5 USC 171z-4.

"(5) No determination that a project is urgently required shall be necessary for projects, the cost of which is not in excess of \$5,000."

SEC. 512. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), is amended to read as follows:

42 USC 1594i.
family housing.

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization Act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) housing units leased, utilizing available operation and maintenance appropriations, for terms of one year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than five years pursuant to the provisions of section 417 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1018).

Exceptions.

69 Stat. 652.
42 USC 1594a.

5 USC 171Z-3.

Housing units.
Limitation.

SEC. 513. (a) Notwithstanding the authorizations for the construction of family housing contained in subsections 104 (a), 204 (a), and 304 (a) of this Act, the total number of units of family housing contracted for during fiscal year 1959 pursuant to the authority contained in such subsections shall not exceed a total of four thousand units. The Secretary of Defense shall determine the total number of units to be constructed by each of the military services in conformity with the provisions of this subsection.

(b) Notwithstanding the authorizations for the construction of family housing contained in subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b) of this Act, the total number of units of family housing contracted for during fiscal year 1959 pursuant to the authority contained in such subsections shall not exceed a total of thirty thousand units. The Secretary of Defense shall determine the total number of units to be constructed by each of the military services in conformity with the provisions of this subsection. The Secretaries of the three military departments, or the designee of each, shall promptly notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives of any determination made hereunder as it affects each such department.

(c) To the extent that any of the authorizations contained in subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b) of this Act to construct housing at locations specified therein are not utilized, such authorizations may be exercised to construct housing at other locations, except that (1) the total number of housing units to be constructed under the authority of this subsection by any service shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total number of units authorized to be constructed by that service under subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), or 304 (b), as the case may be, and (2) the total number of units constructed by the three services pursuant to this authority shall not, when added to the total number of units constructed pursuant to the authority contained in subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b), exceed the total number of units authorized to be contracted for by subsection (b) hereof.

(d) Section 404 (c) of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

“(c) (1) Condemnation proceedings instituted pursuant to this section shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 357; 40 U. S. C. 257), as amended, or any other applicable Federal statute. Before any such condemnation proceedings are instituted, an effort shall be made to acquire the property involved by negotiation. In any such condemnation proceedings, and in the interests of expedition, the issue of just compensation may be determined by a commission of three qualified, disinterested persons to be appointed by the court. Any commission appointed hereunder shall give full consideration to all elements of value in accordance with existing law, and shall have the powers of a master provided in subdivision (c) of rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and proceedings before it shall be governed by the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (d) of such rule. Its action and report shall be determined by a majority and its findings and report shall have the effect, and be dealt with by the court in accordance with the practice prescribed in paragraph (2) of subdivision (e) of such rule. Trial of all issues, other than just compensation, shall be by the court.

“(2) In any condemnation proceedings instituted pursuant to this section, the court shall not order the party in possession to surrender possession in advance of final judgment unless a declaration of taking has been filed, and a deposit of the amount estimated to be just compensation has been made, under the first section of the Act of February

70 Stat. 1111.
42 USC 1594a.
Condemnation
proceedings.

26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421), providing for such declarations. Unless title 40 USC 258a. is in dispute, the court, upon application, shall promptly pay to the owner at least 75 per centum of the amount so deposited, but such payment shall be made without prejudice to any party to the proceeding. In the event that condemnation proceedings are instituted in accordance with procedures under such Act of February 26, 1931, the court shall order that the amount deposited shall be paid in a lump sum or over a period not exceeding five years in accordance with stipulations executed by the parties in the proceedings. In connection with condemnation proceedings which do not utilize the procedures under such Act, the Secretary or his designee, after final judgment of the court, may pay or agree to pay in a lump sum or, in accordance with stipulations executed by the parties to the proceedings, over a period not exceeding five years the difference between the outstanding principal obligation, plus accrued interest, and the price for the property fixed by the court. Unless such payment is made in a lump sum, the unpaid balance thereof shall bear interest at the rate of 4 per centum per annum."

SEC. 514. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States at a unit cost in excess of—

Cost limitation.

- (1) \$32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;
- (2) \$6 per square foot for regular warehousing;
- (3) \$1,850 per man for permanent barracks;
- (4) \$8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 515. Titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1958".

Short title.

SEC. 516. Section 407 (e) of Public Law 85-241, approved August 30, 1957, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1960" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1961".

Rental housing.
71 Stat. 557.
42 USC 1594j.

TITLE VI

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Reserve Forces
Facilities Act
of 1958.

SEC. 601. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) That part of section 2233 (a) that precedes clause (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

70A Stat. 121.

"§ 2233. Acquisition

"(a) Subject to sections 2233a, 2234, 2235, 2236, and 2238 of this title and subsection (c) of this section, the Secretary of Defense may—"

(2) Section 2233 is amended by adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

"(e) The Secretary of Defense may procure advance planning, construction design, and architectural services in connection with facilities to be established or developed under this chapter which are not otherwise authorized by law.

"(f) Facilities authorized by subsection (a) shall not be considered 'military public works' under the provisions of the military construction authorization acts that repeal prior authorizations for military public works."

70A Stat. 121.

(3) The following new section is inserted after section 2233:

“§ 2233a. Limitation

“No expenditure or contribution that is more than \$50,000 may be made under section 2233 of this title for any facility that has not been authorized by a law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces. This requirement does not apply to the following:

Exceptions.

“(a) Facilities acquired by lease.

“(b) Facilities acquired, constructed, expanded, rehabilitated, converted, or equipped to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed, where the Senate and the House of Representatives have been notified of that action.”

(4) The analysis of chapter 133 is amended by inserting the following new item:

“2233a. Limitation.”

64 Stat. 830.
50 USC 882.
10 USC 2231.

SEC. 602. (a) Section 3 of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended by paragraph (a) of the Act of August 9, 1955, chapter 662 (69 Stat. 593), and by section 2 of the Act of August 29, 1957, Public Law 85-215 (71 Stat. 489), is amended by striking out the words “in an amount not to exceed \$580,000,000 over a period of the next eight fiscal years commencing with fiscal year 1951.”

50 USC 882.

(b) Section 3 (a) of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended by section 414 of the Act of August 3, 1956, chapter 939 (70 Stat. 1018), is amended by striking out the words “and without regard to the monetary limitation otherwise imposed by this section”.

70A Stat. 121-
123.

SEC. 603. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

Navy.

(1) For Department of the Navy:

NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Georgia: Training facilities, \$480,000.

Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Supply facilities and utilities, \$259,000.

Naval Air Station, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$652,000.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Navigational aids and utilities, \$179,000.

Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Airfield lighting, \$147,000.

Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Operational and training facilities, liquid fueling and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting, and land acquisition, \$1,992,000.

Naval Air Station, New Orleans (Alvin Callender Field), Louisiana: Administrative facilities, community facilities, navigational aids, operational facilities, supply facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,447,000.

Naval Air Station, New York, New York: Airfield lighting, \$130,000.

Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, New York: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$652,000.

Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, \$570,000.

Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Utilities \$407,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Utilities, \$99,000.

NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

Alameda, California: Waterfront operational facilities, \$128,000.
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Bloomington, Indiana: Training facilities, \$95,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Boston, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$108,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Centralia, Washington: Training facilities, \$81,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Chillicothe, Ohio: Training facilities, \$100,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Danville, Kentucky: Training facilities, \$84,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Dunkirk, New York: Training facilities, \$79,000.

Fort Schuyler, New York: Waterfront operational facilities, \$120,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Hayward, California: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$99,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Honolulu, Hawaii: Training facilities, \$515,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Iowa City, Iowa: Training facilities, \$97,000.

Master Control Radio Station, New Orleans, Louisiana: Communications, \$210,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Olympia (Tumwater), Washington: Training facilities, \$47,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Pasadena, California: Training facilities, \$132,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Port Chicago, California: Training facilities, \$94,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Jose, California: Land acquisition, \$78,000.

Saint Petersburg, Florida: Waterfront operational facilities, \$26,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Steubenville, Ohio: Land acquisition, \$18,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, White Oak (Lewiston), Maryland: Training facilities, \$557,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Yakima, Washington: Training facilities, \$48,000.

MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Lynchburg, Virginia: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$388,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Memphis, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$453,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Moline, Illinois: Training facilities, \$152,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Pasadena, California: Training facilities, \$163,000.

(2) For Department of the Air Force:

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, \$129,000.

Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$3,174,000.

Bates Field, Mobile, Alabama: Maintenance facility, \$97,000.

Bradley Field, Windsor Locks, Connecticut: Maintenance facility and utilities and ground improvements, \$160,000.

Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Maintenance facility, and supply facility, \$325,000.

General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Maintenance facility, and operational and training facilities, \$173,000.

Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, New Hampshire: Operational and training facilities, \$180,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Belton, Missouri: Operational and training facilities, \$101,000.

Naval Air Station (Alvin Callender Field), Orleans Parish, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities, \$622,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facility, \$93,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, and hospital and medical facilities, \$171,000.

Barnes Field, Westfield, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, \$740,000.

Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel, Minnesota: Site improvements, \$500,000.

Birmingham Municipal Airport, Birmingham, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, \$150,000.

Byrd Field, Richmond, Virginia: Supply facilities, \$50,000.

Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, \$579,000.

Capital Airport, Springfield, Illinois: Supply facilities, \$78,000.

Des Moines Municipal Airport, Des Moines, Iowa: Operational and training facilities, \$53,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,308,000.

Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, New Hampshire: Operational and training facilities, \$170,000.

Gulfport Municipal Airport, Gulfport, Mississippi: Supply facilities, \$362,000.

Hayward Municipal Airport, Hayward, California: Operational and training facilities, \$113,000.

Hensley Field, Grand Prairie, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,862,000.

Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$159,000.

Kellogg Field, Battle Creek, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,136,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$570,000.

Martinsburg Municipal Airport, Martinsburg, West Virginia: Operational and training facilities, \$123,000.

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Operational and training facilities, \$1,099,000.

Ontario International Airport, Ontario, California: Operational and training facilities, \$127,000.

Portland Municipal Airport, Portland, Oregon: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, \$233,000.

Rosecrans Field, Saint Joseph, Missouri: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$123,000.

San Juan International Airport, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Supply facilities, \$70,000.

Sky Harbor Airport, Phoenix, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, \$655,000.

Standiford Field, Louisville, Kentucky: Operational and training facilities, and administrative facilities, \$715,000.

Theodore F. Green Airport, Providence, Rhode Island: Operational and training facilities, \$213,000.

Travis Field, Savannah, Georgia: Housing, supply facilities and utilities, \$317,000.

Various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, \$300,000.

(3) For Department of the Army:

Army.

ARMY RESERVE

Batavia, New York: Training facilities, \$171,000.

Beckley, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$289,000.

Beloit, Wisconsin: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Canandaigua, New York: Training facilities, \$171,000.

Canton, Ohio: Training facilities, \$40,000.

Cheyenne, Wyoming: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Durant, Oklahoma: Training facilities, \$141,000.

Fargo, North Dakota: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Fremont, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Galesburg, Illinois: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Greenwood, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$85,000.

Hempstead, New York (Nr2): Training facilities, \$536,000.

Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$99,000.

Kewaunee, Wisconsin: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Madison, Wisconsin (Nr2): Training facilities, \$490,000.

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma (Nr2): Training facilities, \$443,000.

Saint Marys, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Saint Marys, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Salinas, California: Training facilities, \$164,000.

Sinton, Texas: Training facilities, \$134,000.

Stockton, California: Training facilities, \$164,000.

Warren, Ohio: Training facilities, \$289,000.

Weirton, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$149,000.

San Jose, California: Road improvements, \$32,000.

Land acquisition: Training facilities, \$419,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

(ARMORY)

Ackerman, Mississippi: Training facilities, \$54,000.

Agawam, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$210,000.

Amarillo, Texas: Training facilities, \$231,000.

Asheville, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$132,000.

Ashford, Alabama: Training facilities, \$70,000.

Atlanta, Georgia: Training facilities, \$132,000.

Batesburg, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.

Batesville, Mississippi: Training facilities, \$54,000.

Beckley, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$200,000.

Belfast, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.

Belmont, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.

Belton, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$122,000.
Belton, Texas: Training facilities, \$86,000.
Berryville, Arkansas: Training facilities, \$45,000.
Berryville, Virginia: Training facilities, \$135,000.
Bethel, Alaska: Training facilities, \$480,000.
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$45,000.
Boston, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$270,000.
Bridgeport, Alabama: Training facilities, \$70,000.
Brunswick, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.
Caldwell, Ohio: Training facilities, \$135,000.
Calhoun, Georgia: Training facilities, \$110,000.
Camden, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$45,000.
Catskill, New York: Training facilities, \$300,000.
Chesterfield, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
Chester, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, \$206,000.
Cincinnati, Ohio: Training facilities, \$300,000.
Clarksburg, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$189,000.
Clayton, New Mexico: Training facilities, \$57,000.
Clover, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
Cody, Wyoming: Training facilities, \$142,000.
Concord, New Hampshire: Training facilities, \$375,000.
Crossville, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
Cuero, Texas: Training facilities, \$93,000.
Culver City, California: Training facilities, \$38,000.
Dallas Number 5, Texas: Training facilities, \$154,000.
Dayton, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
Duluth, Minnesota: Training facilities, \$37,000.
Eatonton, Georgia: Training facilities, \$90,000.
Edna, Texas: Training facilities, \$93,000.
El Campo, Texas: Training facilities, \$104,000.
Española, New Mexico: Training facilities, \$57,000.
Fairbanks, Alaska: Training facilities, \$277,000.
Farmville, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$98,000.
Fontana, California: Training facilities, \$105,000.
Franklin, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
Fredericktown, Missouri: Training facilities, \$135,000.
Gainesville, Florida: Training facilities, \$120,000.
Gainesville, Texas: Training facilities, \$111,000.
Gardiner, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.
Gassaway, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$189,000.
Greensboro, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$357,000.
Greenville, Ohio: Training facilities, \$165,000.
Hammonton, New Jersey: Training facilities, \$175,000.
Harriman, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
Hendersonville, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$120,000.
Hollister, California: Training facilities, \$105,000.
Honey Grove, Texas: Training facilities, \$90,000.
Houston Number 1, Texas: Training facilities, \$323,000.
Houston Number 2, Texas: Training facilities, \$264,000.
Jerome, Idaho: Training facilities, \$52,000.
Johnston, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
Juncos, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, \$38,000.
Juneau, Alaska: Training facilities, \$450,000.
Kannapolis, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$109,000.
Kealahou, Hawaii: Training facilities, \$145,000.
Ketchikan, Alaska: Training facilities, \$277,000.
Keyser, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$157,000.
Kingsport, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$165,000.

Lake City, South Carolina : Training facilities, \$99,000.
Lasker-Woodland, North Carolina : Training facilities, \$103,000.
Laurinburg, North Carolina : Training facilities, \$105,000.
Lincolnton, North Carolina : Training facilities, \$95,000.
Ligonier, Pennsylvania : Training facilities, \$45,000.
Little Rock, Arkansas : Training facilities, \$260,000.
Livingston, Tennessee : Training facilities, \$91,000.
Logan, West Virginia : Training facilities, \$189,000.
Lovell, Wyoming : Training facilities, \$142,000.
Marietta, Georgia : Training facilities, \$90,000.
Mayaguez, Puerto Rico : Training facilities, \$160,000.
Middleboro, Kentucky : Training facilities, \$130,000.
Millinocket, Maine : Training facilities, \$75,000.
Minneapolis, Minnesota : Training facilities, \$88,000.
Nashville, North Carolina : Training facilities, \$98,000.
New Bern, Tennessee : Training facilities, \$91,000.
New London, Connecticut : Training facilities, \$360,000.
Norfolk, Virginia : Training facilities, \$441,000.
Northwest St. Paul, Minnesota : Training facilities, \$130,000.
Oak Ridge, Tennessee : Training facilities, \$142,000.
Ocean Springs, Mississippi : Training facilities, \$54,000.
Pacolet Mills, South Carolina : Training facilities, \$99,000.
Patchogue, New York : Training facilities, \$375,000.
Persons, Tennessee : Training facilities, \$91,000.
Phoenix, Arizona : Training facilities, \$65,000.
Pitman, New Jersey : Training facilities, \$175,000.
Portland, Maine : Training facilities, \$75,000.
Preston, Idaho : Training facilities, \$57,000.
Princeton, New Jersey : Training facilities, \$175,000.
Pulaski, Virginia : Training facilities, \$135,000.
Quitman, Georgia : Training facilities, \$90,000.
Reynolds, Georgia : Training facilities, \$90,000.
Richmond, Virginia : Training facilities, \$441,000.
Rigby, Idaho : Training facilities, \$57,000.
Rockingham, North Carolina : Training facilities, \$98,000.
Roseboro, North Carolina : Training facilities, \$98,000.
Saco, Maine : \$150,000.
Salem, New Jersey : Training facilities, \$15,000.
Salem, Oregon : Training facilities, \$161,000.
Salem, South Dakota : Training facilities, \$150,000.
San Fernando, California : Training facilities, \$115,000.
San Rafael (Fairfax), California : Training facilities, \$115,000.
Saranac Lake, New York : Training facilities, \$300,000.
Saugus, Massachusetts : Training facilities, \$210,000.
Shallotte, North Carolina : Training facilities, \$95,000.
Silver City, New Mexico : Training facilities, \$57,000.
Sitka, Alaska : Training facilities, \$45,000.
Smithfield, North Carolina : Training facilities, \$98,000.
Smithtown, New York : Training facilities, \$300,000.
Socorro, New Mexico : Training facilities, \$57,000.
South Boston, Massachusetts : Training facilities, \$360,000.
South Pittsburg, Tennessee : Training facilities, \$91,000.
South Portland, Maine : Training facilities, \$150,000.
Saint George, South Carolina : Training facilities, \$99,000.
Stillwater, Minnesota : Training facilities, \$37,000.
Storm Lake, Iowa : Training facilities, \$95,000.
Sturgis, Michigan : Training facilities, \$220,000.
Swanton, Vermont : Training facilities, \$137,000.
Tell City, Indiana : Training facilities, \$188,000.

Texarkana, Texas: Training facilities, \$153,000.
Twin Falls, Idaho: Training facilities, \$90,000.
Valparaiso, Indiana: Training facilities, \$188,000.
Ventura, California: Training facilities, \$115,000.
Wahoo, Nebraska: Training facilities, \$115,000.
Wallace, North Carolina: Training facilities, \$95,000.
Waverly, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
Waynesboro, Tennessee: Training facilities, \$91,000.
Weston, West Virginia: Training facilities, \$189,000.
Whitman, Massachusetts: Training facilities, \$210,000.
Whitmire, South Carolina: Training facilities, \$99,000.
Winnemucca, Nevada: Training facilities, \$110,000.
Yates Center, Kansas: Training facilities, \$93,000.
Yuma, Arizona: Training facilities, \$45,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

(NONARMORY)

Anchorage, Alaska: Administrative and supply facilities, \$192,000.
Augusta, Maine: Administrative and supply facilities, \$190,000.
Burlington, Vermont: Administrative and supply facilities,
\$208,000.
Camp Beauregard, Louisiana: Administrative and supply facilities,
\$325,000.
Camp Beauregard, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities, \$279,000.
Camp Butner, North Carolina: Supply facilities, \$353,000.
Camp Dodge, Iowa: Maintenance facilities, \$80,000.
Camp Dodge, Iowa: Supply facilities, \$120,000.
Camp Shelby, Mississippi: Maintenance facilities, \$165,000.
Columbia, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, \$80,000.
Concord, New Hampshire: Administrative and supply facilities,
\$145,000.
Culbertson, Montana: Maintenance facilities, \$73,000.
Jefferson City, Missouri: Administrative and supply facilities,
\$113,000.
Kalispell, Montana: Maintenance facilities, \$67,000.
Nashville, Tennessee: Administrative and supply facilities,
\$493,000.
Salt Lake City, Utah: Maintenance facilities, \$235,000.
Trenton, New Jersey: Supply facilities, \$80,000.

Additional
facilities.

Report to
Congressional
committees.

Ante, p. 665.

(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection.

Sec. 604. The first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, does not apply to—

(a) facilities that—

(1) have been the subject of consultation with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives before July 1, 1958;

(2) are under contract before July 1, 1960; and

(3) are funded from appropriations made before the date of enactment of this Act; or

72 Stat. 671.

(b) facilities that are authorized by section 603 (4) of this Act; or

72 Stat. 672.

(c) The following facilities for the Air National Guard of the United States:

(1) Milford Point, Connecticut: Operation and training facilities, \$337,000.

(2) Wellesley, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, \$319,000.

(3) Westchester County Airport, White Plains, New York: Operational and training facilities, \$105,000.

SEC. 605. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and section 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Land improvement, etc.

31 USC 529;

40 USC 259,

267.

70A Stat.

269, 590.

40 USC 255.

SEC. 606. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 603 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed—

Appropriation.

(1) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$11,886,000.

(2) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air Force Reserve, \$5,054,000;

(b) Air National Guard of the United States, \$11,976,000.

(3) for Department of the Army: Army Reserve and Army National Guard of the United States, \$28,330,000.

SEC. 607. (a) Any of the amounts named in section 603 of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses 1, 2 (a), 2 (b), and 3 of section 606 respectively.

Cost variations.

(b) The Secretary of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, establish or develop facilities for Reserve forces other than those facilities authorized by section 603 of this Act, except that (1) the total cost of such facilities by any service shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total amount authorized to be expended by that service for projects under

Cost limitation.

such section, and (2) the total cost for all projects established or developed by any service under the authority of this subsection shall not, when added to the total cost of the projects established or developed by such service under the authority of section 603, exceed the amounts prescribed by clauses 1, 2 (a), 2 (b), 3, of section 606, respectively.

Short title.

SEC. 608. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1958".

Approved August 20, 1958.

3540 E